DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 081 107 EA 005 392

AUTHOR	McLain, John D., Ed.; Morgan, Don, Ed.
TITLE	Proceedings of Pennsylvania State Annual Conference on Year-Round Education. (1st, Hershey, Pennsylvania, February 6-8, 1971.)
INSTITUTION	Clarion State Coll., Pa.
SPONS AGENCY	Pennsylvania Council on Year-Round Education.; Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg.
PUB DATE	Feb 71
NOTE	80p.; Related documents are EA 005 393 and 394
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; Computer Assisted Instruction; *Conference Reports; Curriculum Development; Educational Finance; Feasibility Studies; Individualized Instruction; Mathematics Instruction; Program Budgeting; Resource Allocations; School Calendars; *School Schedules; Science Instruction; *Year Round Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The conference, which brought together key leaders from other States to share their experiences with year-round education, focuses on key issues raised during an earlier national conference on the same subject. Some of the topics highlighting conference speeches were: year-round education in transition; analyses of quality education, living patterns, and financial implications; organizing a community study on year-round education; analyzing resources and budgets for year-round education and operation; individualizing math and science; computer assisted instruction; an individualized self-selected elementary program, and case studies of some year-round plans now in operation. (Author/DN)

ED 081107

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Proceedings

First Annual Pennsylvania State Conference On Year - Round Education

PENNSYLVANIA COUNCIL ON YEAR - ROUND EDUCATION

Hershey, Pennsylvania

FEBRUARY 6, 7, 8, 1971

EA 005 392

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:

The Pennsylvania Council on Year-Round Education was organized by the PDE Committee on Year-Round Education and PSEA Cabinet of Presidents Committee on Year-Round Education and is open to other statewide organizations concerned about the school calendar and structure.

The First Annual Pennsylvania State Conference on Year-Round Education was sponsored by the Council in cooperation with the Pennsylvania Department of Education, the Pennsylvania Education Association, the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce and the Research-Learning Center, Clarion State College

Grateful appreciation is extended to Milton S. Hershey School for use of their facilities for this conference.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

Program Planning Committee

H. Stanley Wills, Chairman
Director of Basic Education
Pennsylvania State Education Association

Herbert Edwards
Assistant Director
Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Benjamin D. Hengst
Bureau of Administrative Leadership Service, Specialist
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Everett A. Landin
Director, Educational Development Center
West Chester State College

Don Means
Assistant Director, Educational Development Center
Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College

Registration

Don Morgan
Assistant Director, Field Services
Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College

Ann Denio, Secretary
Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College

Carol Nick, Secretary
Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College

This report has been produced by the Research-Learning Center, Clarion State College. It was edited by John D. McLain and Don Morgan. The manuscript was typed by Ann Denio.

PENNSYLVANIA COUNCIL ON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION
Executive Committee

John L. Kennedy, Chairman, Dir.
Bureau of Curriculum Development
and Evaluation
PDE

John McLain, Executive Secretary
Dir., Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College

H. Stanley Wills, Program Chairman Dir., Basic Education Pennsylvania State Education Assoc.

Jack Whipple, Membership Chairman Education Committee State
Chamber of Commerce

Harry Benedetto
Acting Assistant Bureau Director
Instructional Media Service
PDE

Donald M. Carroll, Jr.
Assistant Commissioner of Basic
Education, Programs and Services
PDE

Herbert Edwards
Assistant Director, Bureau of
Curr. Dev. and Evaluation
PDE

John Graham, Teacher
Penn State University
University Park, Pennsylvania

Edward Grissinger, Superintendent
Jim Thorpe Area Schools
Jim Thorpe, Pennsylvania

Benjamin D. Hengst
Bureau of Adm. Leadership Ser.,
Specialist
PDE

Hugh A. Hodge, Teacher
State College Sr. High School
State College, Pennsylvania

Ernest Johnson
Dir. of Ed. Development Center
University of Pittsburgh at
Johnstown, Pennsylvania

Everett A. Landin
Dir. of Ed. Development Center
West Chester State College

Elaine Schwab, Teacher
Irving Elementary School
Erie, Pennsylvania

Hal Teal, Principal
Taylor Alderdice High School
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Alice TerHaar
Home and School Visitor
Colonial School District
Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania

Tillman Wenk
Curriculum Development Specialist
Bureau of Curriculum Development
and Evaluation
PDE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES

PENNSYLVANIA COUNCIL ON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION
Executive Committee

FIRST GENERAL SESSION 1
YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION IN TRANSITION by Dr. John McLain . . . 2
REMARKS FROM THE DEPARTMENT by Dr. B. Anton Hess 4

CONCURRENT SESSIONS, Monday, February 8, 1971 7
ANALYZING QUALITY EDUCATION by John Billman 9
ANALYZING LIVING PATTERNS by Joseph Dunn 11
ANALYZING FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS by Mervin Manning 21
HOW TO ORGANIZE A COMMUNITY STUDY ON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION by Dr. George B. Glinke 31
HOW TO ANALYZE RESOURCES NEEDED FOR YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION by John Buch 33
HOW TO ANALYZE BUDGETS FOR YEAR-ROUND OPERATION by Dr. Sami J. Alam 37
FOUR QUARTER PLAN, JEFFERSON COUNTY, KENTUCKY by Dr. Oz Johnson 40
A SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS ON THE ST. CHARLES, MISSOURI 9-3 PLAN by Alan M. O'Dell 44
FLEXIBLE ALL-YEAR PLAN, WILSON SCHOOL, MANKATO STATE COLLEGE by Dr. Donald Glines 50

SECOND GENERAL SESSION 57

CONCURRENT SESSIONS, Tuesday, February 9, 1971 58
INDIVIDUALIZING MATH AND SCIENCE by Fred Stewart 59
COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION by David G. Leckvarcik . . . 61
INDIVIDUALIZATION OF MATH-SCIENCE INSTRUCTION THROUGH COMPUTER RELATED INSTRUCTION by Frank Rosenhoover 63
INDIVIDUALIZED SELF-SELECTED ELEMENTARY PROGRAM by Orville Jensen 65

SPEAKERS 66

PARTICIPANTS 69

FIRST GENERAL SESSION

Presiding:	H. Stanley Wills* Director of Basic Education Pennsylvania State Education Association.
Welcome:	Dr. John O. Hershey* President of the Milton S. Hershey School Vice President of Hershey Estates.
Greetings:	Dr. David H. Kurtzman* Secretary Pennsylvania Department of Education.
Address:	"Year-Round Education in Transition: A Follow Up Report on the National Seminar's Position Paper" Dr. John McLain, Director, Research-Learning Center, Clarion State College.
Address:	"Remarks From the Department of Education" Dr. B. Anton Hess, Deputy Secretary and Commissioner for Basic Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education.

* Transcripts of these presentations were unavailable for inclusion in this report.

YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION IN TRANSITION:
A FOLLOW-UP REPORT ON THE NATIONAL SEMINAR'S POSITION PAPER

Dr. John D. McLain
Director, Research-Learning Center
Clarion State College

A major question is being raised across the nation about the length and structure of the school year. Should children go to school longer than the present 180 days? Do all students need to be in school at the same time or for the same length of time? Can the schools be operated more economically on a year-round basis without lessening the quality of education?

The Pennsylvania Department of Education was instrumental in bringing together the key national leaders on year-round education in 1969 to discuss these issues and to plan the Second National Seminar on Year-Round Education which was held in Harrisburg last April.

As an outgrowth of the planning session in 1969 a Statement on Year-round Education was prepared and was adopted as a position paper at the National Seminar.

It recognized that the calendar, as it is presently operated, is not satisfactory to all. At the same time it recognized that no year-round program had yet proved to be universally acceptable.

It recognized that a plan designed to meet the needs of one community may not be acceptable to another community and urged that programs be designed with flexibility rather than rigid, mandatory changes.

The position paper pointed out that every individual is unique and if each student is to learn what he needs to know at his own best rate, the school curriculum must be individualized.

It further pointed out that time schedules of families and students are continuing to become more diverse and that a student's time in school must be adaptable to these changing needs. For example, a major shift is beginning to take place in the labor force, shifting many workers' vacations from the summer time to other times of the year. Parents will want to take their children out of school whenever the father gets his vacation, whether it be summer, fall, winter or spring. At the same time, families and students have already scheduled other activities for the summer. The school cannot arbitrarily take that time away from them.

The American people are spending more for public education today than any other time in history. According to the U. S. Office of Education's estimates the amount being spent on public elementary and secondary education

in 1970-71 is $37 billion for operating costs and $5.5 Billion for capital outlay. Such expenditures amply demonstrate that the American people want and are willing to pay for good schools. At the same time, there is growing evidence that they want their schools operated with economic efficiency, and are demanding "educational accountability."

The position paper of the National Seminar on Year-Round Education recognized this and urged that the school calendar be organized in such a way as to obtain maximum economic efficiency.

It urged each State to provide enabling legislation and policy permitting flexibility so that various patterns of year-round education could be tested. It further urged each State to provide support for such programs and to encourage experimental and exploratory programs on year-round education.

The prime responsibility of developing the school program and adapting it to local needs is the local school district. Each local school was urged therefore to consider ways, including year-round education; (a) to provide quality education with equality in educational opportunity, which necessitates adapting the educational program to the needs of the individual learner, (b) to adapt the school calendar to the changing schedules of the families served by the school, and (c) to attain optimum economic efficiency.

It is strongly urged that when planning for changes in the school year or school calendar that those who would be affected by those changes be involved. This includes teachers, parents, students, and other interested groups.

Before making a change any local school system should make sure the necessary resources, including financial, are well defined and available.

Changes in assignments of teachers and other staff members should be fair and equitable, taking into consideration the teachers' own personal schedules as well as needed effectiveness of the school program.

Following the National Seminar on Year-Round Education, both the Pennsylvania Committee on Year-Round Education established by the Department of Education and the PSEA Committee on year-round education established by the PSEA Cabinet of Presidents studied and approved the position paper.

Together these two committees organized the Pennsylvania Council on Year-Round Education and opened the membership to other interested organizations. It is this Council which is sponsoring this state conference on year-round education It is the purpose of this conference to focus on the major recommendations posed by the National Seminar and to bring to Pennsylvania key leaders from other States to share their experiences with us, so that Pennsylvania can continue to help lead the way in this national movement.

AN IDEA COME OF AGE

Dr. B. Anton Hess
Commissioner for Basic Education
Pennsylvania Department of Education

It is a genuine pleasure to share some thoughts with you on this first state conference on this extremely timely and exciting topic. Although I must admit that I use the modifier exciting with some misgiving. One may ask, how can an idea which has been kicked around for so many years ridiculed, buried alive, and then resurrected, only to be buffeted once more, still be categorized as exciting? Your presence here this evening--in significant numbers--representing a top level of policy determination, gives me cause to speculate that indeed we are on the edge of an exciting breakthough. Perhaps, like M. S. Hershey, after several false starts, we are about to concoct a recipe with popular appeal. We are here to discuss an idea that has come of age.

Yesterday's television, radio and newspapers carried reports of skiing conditions throughout the northeastern United States. Slopes are springing up all over Pennsylvania. Resort owners in the Poconos now report that they are busier during the skiing and snowmobiling season than during the traditional summer vacation period.

The Bureau of the Census tells us that something like 2.7 million people are now engaged in agricultural production. Not all of these are engaged in seasonal production. But even if we consider all of them, they represent only three to four percent of the total labor force. Contrast this with the days before mechanization when half and more of our population got its livelihood from farming.

I cite these two seemingly unrelatedbits of information to underscore the fact that the life style of the American people, both at work and at play, is undergoing drastic change. As an institution which exists to serve society's needs, the public schools must be responsive to changing life styles. We need to give serious consideration not only to what we teach, but also to how, when and through what organizational structure we teach it.

Today's school children no longer are needed at home in the summer to do farm work. Needless to say, the kind of harvest that we reap from idle children in the asphalt jungles of our inner cities could be done without. The fact is that we find ourselves stammering when anyone asks us to justify summer-long vacations on any basis -- except tradition!

The attitude to mothers, generally, may be expressed by this doggerel verse:

> Though children may regret to see,
> The joyous days of summer past,
> I find it hard to hide my glee,
> My kids are back in school at last.

Is it any wonder that treatises on accountability almost invariably include a section on year-round schools? Is it any wonder that critics of the high cost of school construction look askance at idle classrooms three months per year? Is it any wonder that an editorial comment on a recent teacher strike should state,

> "The education lobby notwithstanding, the 180-day school year with its single, summer vacation is pretty much an arbitrary thing -- set up long ago to correspond with the manpower requirements of what was then an agricultural society. Some new concepts in education would provide, in fact, two or three vacation periods during a year.
>
> "It could well be time for the state to re-examine the sacredness of the 180-day school calendar and perhaps provide school boards with some flexibility that would tend to remove the element of crisis from school negotiations."

Is it any wonder that some of our legislators feel impelled, as Senate Bill No. 28 would do, to mandate that "All public kindergartens, elementary and secondary schools shall be kept open" for the entire year.

Our schools have been under attack from right and left. With no compliment intended, we have become known as the establishment which best epitomizes the immovable object which finally withstands the irresistible force. Perhaps the concept of year-round education can prove the catalytic agent, the alchemy which will change our basic nature. In the mirror of the public mind, we need to improve our image -- perhaps become "the fairest of them all."

Frankly, my pleasure at greeting you this evening is akin to the pleasant feeling of being among "kindred souls." We, in the Department of Education, believe that it is high time that some forward looking school systems in our state took a bold step. I believe it would be unwise to prescribe the steps to be taken -- alternative possibilities hold too much promise.

It is regrettable that in considering the opportunities inherent in the year-round school program there is a tendency to think in terms of traditional patterns, quarters, trimesters or other fixed modules of time. There is even a tendency to think that all we would do is provide more of the same for a longer period for the same pupils. In fact, following a public statement I made some time ago in support of year-round education -

I was deluged by critical letters from parents and pupils who imagined that this meant that all children would attend school all year. It is difficult for us to think in terms of the learning center that Dr. McLain is planning at Clarion.

Nevertheless, we must begin to recognize the fact that the year-round school, in fact, provides exciting practical options to a school district, a community, as to how it spends its tax dollars, and how it uses its educational resources.

Suffice it to say that the Department of Education awaits with great anticipation and eagerness to cooperate with the pioneers among you. May the Second Annual Pennsylvania State Conference on Year-Round Education be a report of progress!

CONCURRENT SESSIONS

Monday, February 8, 1971

Workshops:

Section 1: Analyzing Quality Education
Host Moderator: John Billman, Curriculum Development Specialist, Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation, Pennsylvania Department of Education

Section 2: Analyzing Living Patterns
Host Moderator: Joseph Dunn, Curriculum Development Specialist, Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation, Pennsylvania Department of Education

Section 3: Analyzing Financial Implications
Host Moderator: Mervin F. Manning, Assistant Comptroller, Bureau of School Accounting and State Subsidy, Pennsylvania Department of Education

"How To" Clinics

Section 4: How To Organize A Community Study on Year-Round Education. George B. Glinke, Administrative Assistant for Year-Round School Study, Utica, Michigan.
Host Moderator: Harry Benedetto, Acting Assistant Bureau Director, Instructional Media Services, Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Section 5: How To Analyze Resources Needed for Year-Round Education. John Buch, Assistant County Superintendent, Chester County, Pennsylvania.
Host Moderator: Everett Landin, Director, Educational Development Center, West Chester State College.

Section 6: How To Analyze Budgets for Year-Round Operation
Sami J. Alam, Director for Research and Evaluation, Port Huron, Michigan.
Host Moderator: Russell C. Evans, Chief, Distressed Districts Division, Bureau of School Administrative Services, Pennsylvania Department of Education

Discussion Groups About "Plans"

Section 7: Four Quarter Plan, Jefferson County, Kentucky
Dr. Oz Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Research.
Host Moderator: Hugh A. Hodge, Teacher, State College High School, State College, Pennsylvania.

Section 8: 9-3 Plan, St. Charles, Missouri
Alan M. O'Dell, Administrator of Elementary Education.
Host Moderator: Tillman Wenk, Curriculum Development Specialist, Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation, Pennsylvania Department of Education

Section 9: Flexible All-Year Plan, Wilson School, Mankato State College
Don Glines, Director.
Host Moderator: Ernest Johnson, Director of Educational Development Center, University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown.

ANALYZING QUALITY EDUCATION

John Billman
Curriculum Development Specialist
Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation
Pennsylvania Department of Education

The psychological viewpoint that was considered as fundamental to the learning process stressed the belief that children learn at different rates in different ways and need to learn different things.

With the year-round school program, greater flexibility of curriculum may be attained.

Sixty-day units, ninety-day units and various mini-course proposals were suggested.

Individualization of instruction and various non-graded programs were discussed.

Informal educational structure, flexible curriculum and work study programs resulted in an analysis of the Philadelphia Parkway Program. The aspects of this program that were stressed included: the community school concept; cultural facilities of the region; commercial, technical and professional leaders involved in the instructional program; skill development plus necessary theory; tests of performance and competence.

The most important elements related to quality education pointed up teacher empathy and positive self image on the part of the learner.

The program should be student centered rather than subject centered. Humanness of learning must consider curiosity and inquiry in the development of learning interests. An informal educational program of self-directed activities with the eliminating of grades, but with tests of performance and competence was proposed.

Greater commitment of leadership to create change and the provision of time for teachers to really become involved in a flexible instructional program were considered as paramount needs.

Focus is on learning. What important learnings are meaningful? How can learning be self motivating? The Learning Resource Center was considered in relation to the instructional program.

The importance of human relationships, as well as public relation activities, were emphasized in securing community support and understanding.

What educational objectives are to be attained? What is the structure of learning? What emphasis should be given to work study programs and apprenticeship training?

Constraints on the development and implementation of the flexible year-round school program were related to the following: teacher preparation, educational accountability, union movement of teachers, lack of imagination of school building, operation and scheduling, financial cost, fear of teachers in relation of liability for student injury, lack of local leadership, lack of leadership of State Department of Education, traditional educational viewpoints, student teacher aides, career ladder opportunities, educational in-service programs, social class and status relationships.

ANALYZING LIVING PATTERNS

Moderator: Joseph Dunn
Curriculum Development Specialist
Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Reported by Mr. Harry A. Seyler

Leader

Reference: PDE Working Paper - Page 31 Pennsylvania Council on Year-Round Education

Paragraph # 4 - Living Syles of American families are changing

Resetar - Define living patterns of family?

Leader - Five considerations of family living.

1. School year - 180 days - nine months - geared to agricultural living style - needed on farms.

2. Today industrial society - habits how changed - difficult to choose vacation time - most take according to seniority at job.

3. Parents and community in general will be affected by year-round school. What effect on church vacation - bible school? Important pattern in community life.

4. Recreational programs and facilities will affect city and community recreation programs. Use of leisure an important consideration.

5. Farm work in summer will affect this program and would have dire consequences during growing and harvesting seasons. How to give youngsters employment during off-months of year.

Dunn - Who affected? Three groups primarily.

1. Students
2. Parents
3. Community

Resetar - Couldn't children still only go to school for 180 days?

Daley - Only in certain type programs. Most people still want some time in summer? How do you get community to accept idea of different times for different children?

Bowser - Most urban, suburban and rural schools have summer school. Communities want year-round school as it is. Also, summer should be for individualizing instruction.

TerHaar - In 4-quarter or 9-3, a great deal of planning would be required to make this work. Coordination of efforts and work needed.

Bowser - Present plans, trimester, 45-15, 9-3 are all intermediate steps to full year-round school.

Leader - How do we go about getting acceptance in a community?

Daley - How do you parcel out time student should or should not attend - not financial but acceptance seems to be problem?

Crawford - How do we find out what the community will accept? Forget discussing plans, get to real problem of community acceptance first. How do we get them to accept other than 180 days.

Hershey - City can do rather easily. What about the surrounding districts who are affected but not in program.

Dawson - There must be some work with industry in planning for this.

Leader - If district wants to go to year-round how do we convince community to accept?

Frist - 1. Cost of buildings is high, school idle 90 days, no efficiency in building.

2. Farmers no longer need boys at home.

Industry is forcing us to change - most people take December - seniority gets best five weeks.

Bowser - Department getting more half-day requests - utilizing buildings for full year would help with overcrowding. Too much importance put on wanting summers free.

Crawford - Building needs and program since 1963 - five new schools or additions. Despite this need community still not using school properly.

Frist - People don't know about 12 months school. Need to publicize year-round to get people excited. Than they will want it.

Crawford - A ground swell is beginning at home to get an open discussion on flexible year-round schools? How do we get parent-teacher groups to work for and canvass?

Leader - Do we want to ask public as school men or do we get organized and tell them.

Lohr - Need to tell parents full facts and have them make decision. Most feel that programs are foisted upon them.

Resetar - May be a need to combat apathy. Most people feel indifferent about the year-round school.

TerHaar - Flopped most places because it was not fully explained or supported.

Leader - What should the state Department of Education do to assist districts?

Frist - We sometimes must compel people to swallow or it will never get off the ground. Must make people try it. You will get kicks, but it will eventually win out. Legislation needed.

Leader - What sbout local board?

Frist - Boards are in position to force this upon minority who are opposed.

Bowser - Asked Crawford how he would sell to his district (Coraopolis)?

Crawford - Do not want to have board decree the year-round. School board cannot force down public's throat.

Bowser - Would a pilot in some school to look at help you?

Crawford - Yes, we want to know how to get people to see. How do we persuade them to accept idea?

Bowser - Maybe we put in SMSG Mathematics etc , open meetings to have public know and vote on this.

Leader - We have had three or four suggestions on getting acceptance:

1. Through use of media.
2. Through town meetings (open forum).
3. From requests of students and parents of students.
4. Model to be established to look at.

Frist - In the end, after all of these attempts, a final vote is needed. Poll public - questionnaire (?) You would have a straw-poll.

Leader - A fifth thing then is a questionnaire.

A sixth thing is to use a different term for the year-round school.

Moyer - Hope the Department will continue conference of this type.

TerHaar - How many outside (non education) people are attending this conference? Interested in which groups are represented.

Daley - We had citizens' committee report to school superintendent on feeling in community for year-round. Report showed that people did not really understand concept. We are not only interested - we have appointed a task force to study this possibility during this conference. The Committee is composed of all groups in society - parents, non-parents, students, professional educators - charette approach to decide if we want to go into this thing - board will finally have to make decision. We hope that after a year a majority will be in favor.

Leader - Would't an IPI approach in regular school shut off need for the present summer school.

Dawson - Will specialized teachers be needed for IPI or other techniques?

Bowser - Not necessarily--retraining of staff perhaps.

Lohr - Need to return to living patterns - How will this affect teachers who only want to teach nine months?

Leader - Know of no study - often depends upon husband's job.

Hershey - Isn't there evidence that many have tried system and didn't work and returned to regular 180 day.

Leader - Not many on a full scale that I know of.

Hershey - My evidence is that many have tried and dropped it.

Leader - To TerHaar - Were national norms given at the national conference?

TerHaar - Not really full programs - usually money is not sufficient to successfully finance it.

Bowser - Aliquippa and Butler were not really financed well enough to follow through to completion.

Leader - How does mobility affect the concept? I've moved 15 or 20 times - What affect will a flexible school have on moving children.

TerHaar - Problem similar to new math problem for children coming in middle of program. Unless year-round be adopted widespread, it will only increase the problem.

Bowser - What would be different from what happens how?

TerHaar & Bowser - Individualized would perhaps be better?

Frist - This is only a minor consideration.

Leader - Not minor - State sectionalized - district differences in school programs and styles of school: A serious problem in state now. Do we need to go statewide in mandating individualized flexible program or allow districts to decide.

Crawford - Difficult for student to transfer from a standard set-up to a flexible one. In the middle of the year, children must adjust - District can never have a school flexible to the point ot accepting differences of incoming students? IPI might make it happen easier.

Leader - Flexible school might be a better thing than we have now.

Crawford - Yes.

Frist - Put in news media what will the affect be on the pocketbook. Should deal with public on money saving prospects?

Bowser - Year-Round will not save money. It will most often cost more - more staff - more materials, etc. What you save on capital outlay will be absorbed in other ways.

Crawford - Maintenance will go up tremendously.

Leader - Flint, Michigan's Community school superintendent says maintenance costs were cut considerably by year-round program.

Dawson - Have parents realize this will benefit children in community. Key to problem.

Leader - Anything left over? If not, we are adjourned. 10:40 a.m.

Second Session

Leader

Reference: PDE Working Paper - Page 31 Pennsylvania Council on Year-Round Education

Paragraph # 4 - Living Styles of American families are changing.

A. What changes have occurred in living patterns of families? Who will be affected?

B. Three people groups affected.

1. Student
2. Parents and family
3. Community--industry, religion, etc.

C. Five areas of concern.

1. Agricultural society change-farms not as important.
2. Churches and religious schools-bible schools.
3. Industry-seniority system-changes in vacation due to industry and not schools necessarily.
4. Mobile society.
5. Recreation and recreation facility.

Leader - Ask Holden now they brought about an interest and establishment of year-round school?

Holden - 550 kids K-12 - We started with parent meetings. Full year-round school - 12 months - work all year round. Does not teach year-round but has vacation period as others do. Some parents not used to this kind of innovative system. Pull kids out and put into other public schools. Newspapers announce meetings and parents attend - do not always approve.

Feinerman - How do you take care of transferred students?

Holden - Individually counseled - go over permanent record - place student according to where he is. Non-graded - child-centered school entirely.

Leader - Let's get back to community and how you got started - What part did community play?

Holden - Now discussing new high school - article in paper - somewhere between extreme child centered and traditional systems. There is a need for a Donald Glines to shake people up.

Leader - How does business support you?

Holden - We're now only six or seven percent of school population. If there were a sudden change, this would be quite controversial.

Leader - I would enjoy school more if there were individually prescribed instruction. My children begin to dislike school at about third grade level.

Seyler - What guarantee do we have that students will ever become interested enough to want to go through this type of program?

Holden - We do not turn them on in structured classrooms in the nation. Students tune out teachers anyway. Why not let them tune on for themselves.

Garvin - If students not in class, how can they learn shorthand.

Holden - Get them to think it is fun. They will learn.

Yerger - We have turned kids off in early years - Question is how do we turn them on again? Student wanted in special education. He really wanted to work with mechanics. Needed to learn to read to get a job. Reading on second grade level at twelve years of age. Turned off in second grade.

Holden - When parents want to take vacation in cold months and take families - our system permits this. Hunting trips are educational - kid can plug in and plug out as he wants to.

Leader - What mobility is there? Can student leaving your system adjust?

Holden - Not sure how they do after leaving our system. We need to take a closer look.

Leader - What role should state play in this area of year-round?

Yerger - Would prefer state department not mandate year-round. It would turn people off.

Garvin - Lend support to district - not mandatory.

Leader - How about one experimental school in district?

Garvin - It might help school attendance if education were not compulsory.

Leader - Do you use computer assisted instruction?

Holden - We are beginning to get into this.

Leader - How are faculty people chosen?

Holden - Donald Glines changed things, got rid of traditionalists who could not change, some left voluntarily.

Leader - What are problems or negative aspects of your type of system?

Yerger - Aren't most kids there by choice - you mean they still don't like it?

Holden - Some kids continue to float in limbo - some kids would not achieve in traditional schools. At least we are not making them bitter. Kids will always have trouble adjusting.

Leader - Aren't our lives structured to the extent that we cannot accept flexibility for our kids or ourselves?

Holden - We must break the lock-step - you need to feel free and you are free.

Garvin - But would a 15 year old ever want to get to work?

Leader - Any more questions of Mr. Holden? If not, we are adjourned. 12:48 p.m.

Third Session

In this eyeball to eyeball contact, Mr. Shaheen discussed with the discussion leader and recorder the interests he has in the year-round concept. The following points were viewed:

1. What curriculum considerations need to be made to accommodate a year-round school program?

2. What materials and equipment will be needed in this set-up?

3. Would IPI be a way of making the program more accommodating to this concept?

Mr. Dunn adjourned the meeting at 3:50 p.m.

At 4:00 p.m. a paper with 15 suggested questions for the evening dinner panel was given to Mr. Edwards. These questions came from the three sessions on "Analyzing Living Patterns."

ANALYZING FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Moderator: Mervin E. Manning
Assistant Comptroller
Bureau of School Accounting and State Subsidy
Pennsylvania Department of Education

Reported by Mr. Robert G. McMinn

Senate Bill 28 was introduced January 28, 1971. It took away from the school board the right to set a term. The terms were set as 12 consecutive months in all classes. All schools will change, to be open all year, the school year to be divided into quarters or trimesters. Nine hundred and ninety hours of instruction are equivalent to 180 days.

There are two types of costs to analyze: (1) operational (4 quarters save over 3%); (2) capital outlay (no new buildings needed).

An article in Nation's Schools (December, 1970) about Atlanta's Year-Round Schools was discussed. The conclusion was that the year-round program cost more money, particularly under operational costs. In Atlanta, teachers were offered another quarter's salary which they liked. The students liked it because the extra quarter was voluntary. The public and business were for it. It distributes activities throughout the year. Taxpayers did not complain about the added salary because teachers worked more. The assumption was noted, as it had been many times before, "If I operated business like you operate schools, I would go broke."

Several alternatives in school scheduling were mentioned and discussed: (1) Four Quarter; (2) Trimester; (3) 11 months; (4) Flexible (all year round) which keeps students in school all year round with short vacations. Students graduate three years early (age 15). The Four Quarter Plan will reduce enrollment in each quarter by about 25%.

In the discussion, Mr. Manning pointed out the danger of trying to sell a plan solely on economy. The schools will always be expanding the amount of money in education, but year-round will permit it to be spent on instruction. (For every $3.00 for instruction, only $1.00 will be spent for building rental.) Don't tell people it will save money, as the operational budget may expand. It is more a question of best utilization of buildings to save money in this area.

Comments:

Johnson — What is the chance of the State increasing the reimbursement to school districts instituting

year-round school? School boards want to know if year-round schools will save money. Other points in question are quality education and flexibility.

Payne — Psychological element - if a person is subjected to emergency condition, he will want to get out as soon as possible. We must institute year-round education not as an emergency. We must do it as experimentation.

Manning — Barriers must be broken down. If you still have them after emergency, the people will want to return.

Expenditures:

Many in administration are already on a 12-month schedule. Those not on a 12-month contract must be. These costs will probably increase. Costs will change 0% to 12%.

Some elementary schools would be without a principal for one month (those schools with no assistant principal). The solution for large districts would be to rotate vacations of the principals. Smaller schools may have more problems.

Scheduling will have to be done four times each year with an increase of administrative costs.

Whole school organization will need to be looked at. A complete change may be required since all areas must be looked at, especially administration.

Teachers may be employed an extra quarter for curriculum development and revision, which will mean added cost (more than now planned.) Merit pay might be used as an added incentive.

Differentiated staffing will probably be required, entailing extra work for the staff.

Plant Maintenance:

There would be a 25% decrease in the need for buildings and grounds (facilities), with a 25% increase in the amount of time used. Some costs remain constant; however, net savings could be 12%.

There will be a number of problems encountered; for example, the 25% fewer facilities is an optimum figure. When will repairs and cleaning take place? Perhaps this will have to be done on weekends, which may require overtime rates. The use of part-time maintenance personnel is not most efficient. There is a question as to whether the maintenance staff can be reduced by 25%. Continued use may require same level. The ratio of maintenance demand to student population could be determined.

A suggested solution was to build all new schools for year round. Plan it for year round - for 1800 enrollment, not 2400.

Plant Operation:

Fuel costs would go down because the buildings would be smaller and fewer. However, summer use will require air conditioning, which may or may not be added costs.

The number of custodians would be less while custodial supplies remain constant (same number of students). This could mean a savings of 0% to 5%.

Comments:

Tyson — The same number of janitors may be required because of the same number of pupils. Twenty-five percent fewer facilities but 30% more work. You still have to do the major jobs (preventive or catch-up). In the summer cannot spend time outside.

Food services and health services:

The same number of students require fewer workers; therefore, no gain or loss. If the cafeteria is open all year, it will cost more. The cafeteria staff cannot be cut to save money. The employment of nurses will be required during the summer, increasing costs. Health examinations will have to be done more than once a year to hit all students. Therefore, the conclusion must be drawn that costs will increase.

Other programs:

Recreation activities must be provided for students of each quarter, which may require ice rinks, skiing, etc., to match those facilities provided for summer. Schools will have to provide interscholastic and intramural activities into the summer.

Many Title I programs are now run during the summer. Perhaps these programs should be in the regular school year. There may be increased costs in this area also.

Instructional salaries:

Fewer teachers will require a 33% increase in time for a 20% increase in salary. The assumption that staff can be reduced by 25% is questionable. Requirements for new teachers to get credits will prevent them from working; therefore, older teachers will get the extra work. This will require colleges to adapt. Perhaps professors could be sent out for night work. College students could be required to meet the schedule of the schools. Credit will be offered for in-service programs in school districts.

Transportation:

More buses will be required, according to the density of pupil population. Therefore the cost will be greater.

Question: Legislation and PDE are selling "year-round school" as a means for <u>great</u> savings to the taxpayer. It will be up to the superintendent to explain the facts.

Panel question: why are they doing this?

Second Session

Again, the article in Nation's Schools about Atlanta's Year-Round School program was discussed. It was noted that an attempt must be made to begin year-round education as a means to improve curriculum, not as simply a means to save money.

Under "Expenditures", it was pointed out that there would be a change in administration costs of 0% to 12%.

Comments:

Duncan — Year-Round Education will require all administrators to be on a 12 month contract.

McCarter — Does the Department of Education have funds available for school districts to run pilot programs on year-round schools? Michigan school districts have received state money to run pilot programs.

Act 80 is tremendous legislation, but the burden is on the local district to get funds to move in this direction. State legislation should now provide funds.

The same question is asked by taxpayers about reorganization. "I thought you were going to save money." Answer no! But it is more economical. This is the same situation with year-round schools. The real result of year-round schools will be better programs and not savings of money.

Plant maintenance and plant operation:

There would be a 25% decrease in facilities with a 25% increase in use of facilities. Not all of the maintenance costs are related to use (roof). This would result in a 12% saving.

Staff could be decreased but air conditioning may affect savings. Savings may be from 0% to 5%.

Comments:

Walker — Most discussion in regard to year-round schools mentioned school enrollments of 58,000 to 60,000. This will not be the case in Pennsylvania. It will mean a decrease in custodial staff.

Walker — It will not mean a decrease in custodial staff.

McCarter — It will mean a decrease in custodial staff if you consider the staff if you build more buildings. Research should point more in this direction. Example: costs for one high school as compared to two high schools.

Chairman — Those districts to benefit most financially from year-round education are those involved in a building program.

Walker — Will this mean a new building will not be built? It probably will have to be built at a later date because of growth.

Chairman — Will buildings wear out faster with year-round education?

Walker — In my area there is a great growth. If we don't build now, we will have to build say 15 years from now which will cost much more.

Mickley — How can we in Lancaster City go into all year school without all the districts in the county following? Wouldn't this result in chaos since people don't always live and work in the same school district.

Chairman — Small districts may have more problems than large districts.

Mickley — It would almost have to be a county plan.

Johnston — Answer to previous question --buildings probably will wear out sooner. This may cause higher cost.

Duncan — Buildings do not wear out - they just become out of style.

Mickley — Old buildings may not adapt to new programs.

Chairman — What happens to the summer maintenance programs?

Duncan — There would be vacant classrooms, or you could close one building a year.

Walker — Maintenance can be done weekends, holidays, nights and emergencies can be handled as they arise.

<u>Other (Health and Food Services)</u>:

There would be no gain or loss because of constant enrollment.

Mickley — What about extra time needed for running cafeteria during the extra time?

It was concluded that expenditure would show gain.

Mickley — Salaries for nurses would increase because they would be employed all year.

Other Programs:

Duncan — What about football and basketball?

Chairman — Could be resolved by scheduling.

Now there is an abundance of summer recreation facilities. With vacations during other parts of the year, facilities will have to be provided. Example: ice rinks, etc.

Instructional Staff Salaries:

Net cost change would be 0% because the total staff can be reduced.

Chairman — Question of Act 195 (Teacher Negotiations) What affect will year-round education have on negotiations?

Ruddy — In Kentucky teachers asked for one-third more salary for one-fourth more work. This probably will be the case in Pennsylvania. Because of Act 195, there will be a tremendous increase in salary costs.

Chairman — Reduction in class size may not be uniform. Two teachers still may be needed.

Urey — The question is with the school board. Are you going to spend the money? Who should make decision on questions of educational process, educators or school board? Should we make changes in the organization to permit experts to make the decision?

Duncan — In presenting budgets, principals should present two budgets, one flowered or padded and one that is bare essentials.

Urey — There is much waste in industry and business also. Perhaps you have to have someone to whom you are responsible.

Duncan — An example: I found five new teacher's desks unused in the junior high school while the principal asked for new ones in his budget.

Transportation:

Twenty-five percent fewer pupils mean fewer or smaller buses. Sparsity-density of pupil population becomes a factor.

Johnston Cost will probably go up in regards to Pennsylvania.

What changes in reimbursement will come about for schools extending the school? What effects will this have for fiscal year reporting?

Third Session

Administration:

Chairman	Costs of administration will increase 0% to 12%.
Montgomery County	Increased efficiency of internal school operation will be effected.
Bedford County	Duties of administrators will change. When are they going to do all the things that usually get done when the students are not in session?
	Scheduling would become a problem in small courses.

Transportation:

Bedford County	Three hundred square miles in the district of 3500 pupils. Transportation would have to be continued all year. Question: Will the PDE reimburse for year-round transportation costs?
Chairman	Act 90 limited a district's liability for reimbursable transportation.
Bedford County	We would have difficulty in filling buses on certain routes if enrollment decreased by 25%.
	In our district, the operating costs may increase to the point where it is above yearly rental.
Montgomery County	Could use Sunday school classrooms for regular school rooms (kindergarten). This would eliminate the need for new classrooms. Churches certainly could use the money.
Bucks County	It may be necessary to run school buses all day because of the flexible scheduling. Perhaps the school buses could be used for public transportation.

Plant Maintenance and Plant Operation:

Bucks County	There will be summer maintenance problems. These problems have been solved by industry. Higher costs now but long range costs would tend to reduce because of fewer buildings.
	Maintenance services may be put out on contract.

Montgomery County There is no problem on maintenance.

Conclusion:

Operating costs would increase slightly, including air conditioning.

Instructional salaries:

Montgomery County We must go year-round or soon we will be paying year-round salaries to teachers for only nine months work. If one district goes year round it will be able to hire the better teachers.

The teachers will be paid a salary equivalent to a full year's salary because of strong negotiations. Now is the time for year-round schools.

HOW TO ORGANIZE A COMMUNITY STUDY ON YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

Dr. George B. Glinke
Administrative Assistant for Year-Round School Study
Utica, Michigan

Moderator: Mr. Harry Benedetto

Reported by M. Wayne Neff

Define Problem - Initial Step

Why do you think you need Year-Round Education?

Phases

Conduct Feasibility Study

Survey (Random Sampling)

Determine what to ask people (historical analysis)

Establish Citizen Advisory Committee - Fact feeding and not fact finding

Cross section of community

Analyze building needs, finances, curriculum, staff, etc.

Use diplomacy and very positive approach since it is very controversial.

Locate seed money funding source for operating study

Communication

Develop media to provide information

Slide presentations

Community dinner (leaders of community)

Small groups in community - P.T.A., service groups, neighborhood groups, etc.)

Conversion

Modification of present curriculum to accommodate new program.

Pilot Program

Select level and school(s)

Implementation

If pilot program proves successful then implement

Modify according to pilot findings

Key Questions

What different plans considered?

How does Year-Round Concept effect Carnegie Unit?

Effects of mandated Year-Round Education (Senate Bill 28)?

HOW TO ANALYZE RESOURCES NEEDED FOR YEAR-ROUND EDUCATION

John Buch
Assistant County Superintendent
Chester County

Moderator: Dr. Everett Landin

Reported by Leann Miller

Mr. Buch opened each of the three sessions with introductory statements, a sampling of which are presented here.

I believe year-round designs or plans for year-round schools and there are many resources to consider. Some of these can be assets; some can be liabilities. Four real resources are basic to the success of any year-round school proposal:

1. Commitment of all concerned,
2. Dedication to see it through--it will take five-six years, at least,
3. Objectivity--a willingness to scrutinize the design and see where it is working and where it is not working and
4. Time--a great deal.

The nine-month school year may not be the most valid system for the '70s. Children should have an opportunity to learn all year. Child growth and development does not take place on a nine-months-on, three-months-off basis. Testing shows that children lose some learnings over those three summer months.

Why are there 500 dropouts a year in Chester County? Some answers can be found in the limited course offerings in some high schools and in the schedules which children follow in the traditional school. A study of some 200 student schedules reveals that 20-50 percent of time in school is often spent in study halls.

Some problems may be resolved by implementing year-round school designs.

1. Criticism of teacher salaries and contracts.

   If teachers only want to work nine months, they get paid for nine months; teachers who work longer also get paid for it.

2. The push for better utilization of vocational-technical schools.

   Their facilities could be scheduled for more efficient use.

3. Public-nonpublic schools' conflicting cries for state funds.

4. Teacher certification.

   A teacher, after working several full years, can take a semester for study in his need areas. In this way he is either devoting his full time to teaching or courses, not the demanding schedule of both at once, as is the case with evening and Saturday courses.

5. Drop-out prevention ("Drop-in" programs).

   If children find they can't do a job outside or need more training, they can come back to school any time, without stigma.

Second Session

To illustrate that operating schools year-round does not save money, Mr. Buch presented a chart outlining actual and anticipated expenditures for Chester County schools, over a nine year period. While he predicts that by 1974-75, the county will be spending $104.5 million for "traditional education," he cites that it could be operating year-round classes for the same amount. Year-round schools may not cost less money, but they would afford the potential for more educational opportunities for children, i.e., more value for the dollar. It is on this basis that they can be sold to school boards.

Third Session

Discussion sessions centered on some of the following items:

1. Can savings be realized through better use of facilities? Over the long haul, yes. A year-round program being planned now should not start before the '73-'74 school year. Your district community must redefine education so that the basic issue is quality education.

2. Many year-round plans can cause the potential to exist for children to attend their 13th and 14th years in their home school districts.

3. What is quality education? An overworked phrase, for one. There are many different definitions. It can be more educational opportunities for children in relation to money spent. The cost benefits of programs could be evaluated through the use of a good PPBS system.

4. Many year-round programs designs result in the need for fewer teachers.

5. Many districts are already reacting to pressures for economy and quality by offering summer courses and mini-courses (6, 9, or 12 weeks) or by otherwise redesigning offerings. These can be first steps toward year-round scheduling.

6. Effects on the community must be investigated, i.e., designs which allow children to enter the labor market early; designs which scatter children's vocations.

7. How large (small) must (can) a district be to have an effective year-round program? The community must be taken into account here (#6), as well as other resources. Perhaps several districts should begin on a "shared concern" basis.

8. We won't save money, so will it cost a district more money in a year?

9. Has any district introduced, over a period of years, a meaningful, comprehensive program which could be visited and evaluated? Has there been any research done in these schools?

10. Will scheduling be a problem? Teachers in some year-round designs such as the 45-15 Plan will assume a greater counseling role because under this scheduling, students will have four curriculum choices in one year rather than just one or two.

11. Will a longer school year be counter to the labor unions' demands for a three or four day work week?

12. Involve teachers in planning to restructure study halls. In Governor Mifflin School District this has been done, and teachers and students are pleased with the results. Students are responsible for choosing their own activity during these periods.

13. Schools must become more management-conscious under new designs.

14. Rescheduling cannot be accomplished without curriculum revisions. Many schools have the needed expertise on their present faculties.

15. IU's could serve as catalysts to districts desiring to reschedule: convene them and assist them in expanding the curriculum into their respective communities.

16. Will state funds become available for planning and establishing experimental year-round programs? Will the state establish and support models which other districts can study? Districts can now receive 50 percent reimbursement on a new building, none on such an experimental program.

17. Industry may complain that schools are not training students well enough. When it becomes a planner in new systems, industry can articulate its concerns. It can also be made aware of its responsibility to employes.

18. What designs are most feasible and most economical? The five-quarter plan can be one of the best if the offerings in all five periods are of equal quality to attract students all year. The teachers must begin to develop nine-week course units as a prerequisite to this plan.

19. A strong administrator who takes the lead can be an asset to the development of such a program.

20. What about scheduling sports and other extra-curricular activities?

HOW TO ANALYZE BUDGETS FOR YEAR-ROUND OPERATION

Dr. Sami J. Alam
Director for Research and Evaluation
Port Huron, Michigan

Moderator: Russell C. Evans

Reported by Matthew Harris

The purpose of the Port Huron Area School District's study was that of examining the economic, educational and physical feasibility of the four-quarter plan with an assigned vacation. The choice of this plan for further study resulted from the examination of research and literature regarding different forms and uses of the four-quarter plans. The plan studied would allow for closing of eight elementary schools until future enrollments warrent their re-opening. The plan envisions that the capacity of the buildings remaining would be increased by 33 1/3%, due to the fact that 25% of the total enrollment would be on vacation at any one time during the year. The remaining buildings could absorb about 2300 more youngsters without over-crowding. Youngsters would be bused from the closed schools and classrooms to the most conveniently located buildings available. The vacation quarter would be assigned randomly, assuring families that both brothers and sisters would have the same vacation quarter.

Teachers, under such a plan, would be contracted to work a minimum of three quarters per year. The placement and scheduling of youngsters for the 1969-70 regular school year were simulated. The actual expenditures for the 1968-69 regular school year were compared with the expected 1968-69 regular school year with a four-quarter plan. The preliminary expense budget for the 1969-70 school year was also compared with the budget of expenditures projected for the same school year using a four-quarter plan.

With the above completed, it was concluded that the plan would be physically, economically and educationally feasible if certain conditions were to be met.

Foremost among the criteria to be met was that the present curriculum would have to be revised to better meet the needs of the youngsters under a four-quarter plan of school year operation.

It is evident that since the plan calls for the youngsters to attend three sixty-day quarters instead of the traditional two ninety-day semesters, curriculum revision must accompany the move to the proposed plan. If such condition is to be met, it must be understood that the reorganization and refinement of curriculum will necessitate that content within each discipline

in the program of instruction will have to be evaluated relative to its objectives and relevance. This procedure would force addition, deletion, and/or rewriting where needed.

Another criterion which must be met, according to the study, was that of community support and acceptance. A plan that drastically changes vacation habits of the community must be supported by the community with all its segments. Business and industry, as well as the teaching and operational staffs of the school district, must be supportive of the plan.

The plan discovered that an additional 3.87 mills would be required for the operation of the schools during the first year of the plan, including 1.5 mills for the installation of air conditioning in the buildings operating. The cost, after the first year, would amount to an additional 2.5 mills above and beyond the levy presently collected. The study indicated that the cost of constructing the additions and buildings required to resolve overcrowding would require a total of 5.6 mills per year for thirty years.

Three surveys were conducted to assess the attitude of the community, the business and industrial representatives, and the certified staff to the four-quarter plan. While 47% of the representative sample of the registered voters favored the four-quarter plan of school year operation, 37% of them were opposed to it, with 16% who did not express an opinion. It is interesting to note, however, that when parents of youngsters in schools were surveyed separately as to their first preference for a vacation quarter, 89% of those parents picked the summer quarter as their first choice. The business and industrial community was evenly divided in its approval or rejection of the plan.

In surveying the teachers, it was discovered that 39% of the staff opposed the four-quarter plan compared to 35% who favored it and 26% who did not express an opinion. When confronted with the question of whether they would want to work under a four-quarter plan, the majority of the teachers stated that they would continue to work under those conditions. The majority of the staff appeared to prefer a summer quarter for a vacation, if given a choice.

Following is the suggested school year calendar:

First Quarter - July 1 - September 23

Second Quarter - September 24 - December 21

Third Quarter - December 22 - March 23

Fourth Quarter - March 24 - June 17

Holidays:

Labor Day

Two Institute days

Thanksgiving day

Christmas - 5 days

New Years - 2 days

Easter - 4 days

Summer - 12 days

The complete study on the Port Huron School District is available for $4.00 by writing to the Port Huron School District, Port Huron, Michigan.

FOUR QUARTER PLAN, JEFFERSON COUNTY, KENTUCKY

Dr. Oz Johnson
Assistant Superintendent for Research

Moderator: Hugh A. Hodge

Reported by Gene Urbanski

What is involved in the implementation of a year-round program of education? Let me outline the scenario used by the Jefferson County School System to arrive at a decision that it should depart from the time-honored 180-day school calendar. This scenario will show the entrances and exits of individuals and groups who were instrumental in bringing about a dramatic decision regarding what the school calendar of the future will be in Jefferson County.

For all practical purposes the play began in November 1968, when Superintendent Richard VanHoose announced at a news conference that the Jefferson County School System was going to conduct a feasibility study to determine if the time might not be ripe to turn away from the September to June School calendar. At that time he indicated that I would be director of that study, and he released the names of some half a hundred people who would serve on citizens advisory committees. Consequently, I wish to make the first point: There must be much community involvement if a school system plans to make a smooth transition away from the time-honored school calendar.

The community should be taken in on the ground floor. By using "white papers," brochures, questionnaires, and study groups the community can be involved in the decision-making process. In addition to developing a feasible extended school-year, community relations can be improved in the process. More important, however, is the idea of causing the school staff and community to see the need for innovation in school organization. Keeping instruction and curriculum relevant and updated is the prime function of the school administrator. Therefore, rescheduling of the school calendar can become the framework for building a stronger education structure. It can also cause the community to be more readily agreeable to examination of new ideas in education.

Make no mistake, the year-round school concept is controversial. Opposition will come from unexpected quarters. We learned this lesson very early in Jefferson County. A news conference was thought to be a suitable means of informing the public about the school staff's intention of conducting an extended school year feasibility study.

We received extensive coverage as a result of that news conference. You must have a considerable amount of additional information pertaining to the scope and intent of what you are about, because the news media are not equipped to give the in-depth sort of treatment desired by this topic.

In the first place there is no accepted terminology, even among school men, which adequately describes year-round or extended school year designs. Consequently, the announcements made via the news media tended to polarize opposition. Much of the opposition was created because the citizenry lacked information. Many individuals thought that extension of the school year would begin immediately, that children would be arbitrarily staggered in and out of school. In other words, the worst features of a number of plans were perceived by the people to be what the school staff would incorporate into one plan and then impose same upon the students. However, this notion was soon dispelled because the advisory committee was at work reviewing a number of school calendar plans.

Some of the plans were designed to assign pupils arbitrarily to school on a staggered basis. Because of the numerous problems these plans presented, they were, for the most part, looked upon with disfavor. But in February 1970, the Citizens Advisory Committee recommended that the school staff begin the process of informing the public about the potentials of the Continuing Four-Quarter Plan, hoping that the Board of Education through a policy decision would dictate that the plan become operational at a future date.

The Jefferson County School System made this information available to the public. The following format was developed to give the staff direction to complete the work that lay ahead:

1. A statement of philosophy which spelled out the advantages of the Continuing Four-Quarter Plan for students as well as for economic reasons.

2. A compiled list of assumptions, e.g., that each quarter consist of sixty days, that the fourth quarter be tuition free, that teachers be paid on a pro rata basis for additional days taught, upon which to make rational decisions.

3. A request for the cooperation of the State Department in determining how existing law, policy, and regulations will affect the endeavor.

4. A prepared statement as to the impact that new curriculum has upon the use of textbooks, supplementary books, and teaching materials.

5. The outlining of alternatives available to pupils, e.g., starting dates, vacation time, course offerings, etc.

6. Spelled out procedures for the process of writing new curriculum:

    a. The size of each committee in each discipline and the various grade levels.

    b. The estimated length of time needed to complete the work.

    c. Determining whether the work was to be continuous, day after day, or whether it should be on a part-time or during the summer months basis.

7. Estimated costs: secretarial, substitute teacher, materials, printing, and the like.

8. A well-defined program of orientation for principals, counselors, teachers, parents and students and designated persons responsible to carry on the activities.

The foregoing is, in capsule, the process used in Jefferson County. Time would not permit me to outline all of the staff meetings, visits to service clubs, coffee klatches, and news briefings necessary to get the desired information across to the public However, I wish to dwell upon the importance of keeping the news media up-to-date. I hold to the notion that there can be no secrecy in public school administration. Consequently, at every extended school year meeting the news media were invited. Without question, the overall news coverage was excellent. The staff received much editorial support. I doubt that this would have been true had we not bent over backward to welcome and keep informed members of the press. I do not mean to say that the news media are without fault. In fact the headlines invariably gave the impression that all pupils will attend school the year around. When the study was first announced, the headlines were so threatening to the people that our switchboard at the central office was all but overloaded for an entire day. One man called to state that the school staff had supplied him with the necessary platform plank to be elected to the General Assembly. And he stated in unequivocal terms that, if elected, he would introduce legislation to prevent children from going to school all year.

Let me suggest you inform the public of the advantages of the selected plan in the following ways:

1. The staff should visit and take part in study groups at the schools.

2. Articles of explanation should be written by students for their high school papers.

3. Students may visit a school system operating on an extended school-year plan to see what is being done there. They then should write articles, appear on television programs and work with study groups.

4. A faculty telecast with the Superintendent, the president of a teachers' organization, a research administrator, etc. can spotlight aspects of the plan that are of interest to teachers.

5. Encourage Board members and staff members to speak to service clubs and civic groups.

6. Prepare a list of twenty most frequently asked questions and give answers to these.

7. Surveys to determine the feeling of each sub part of the system must be taken.

8. Obtain letters of endorsement from civic clubs, businessmen, congressmen, and other far-sighted citizens.

9. Involve principals and supervisors in meetings to dialogue on uniform information and answers they will pass on to teachers, students, and parents.

10. Devote an issue of your school system's newsletter or paper to giving a brief, concise concept of your selected plan.

A SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS ON THE ST. CHARLES, MISSOURI 9-3 PLAN

Alan M. O'Dell
Administrative Assistant, Elementary Education
Francis Howell School District

Moderator: Tillman Wenk

Reported by Clarence T. Berner

Community

St. Charles is a suburban community of St. Louis. It is an exceedingly fast growing area - the fastest growing area in the state of Missouri. It is mostly suburban in population but a great deal of the territory is sparsely settled rural country.

The Present School Setup

The Francis Howell School District has four (4) elementary schools, one junior high school, and one senior high school. The 9-3 plan was started in Becky-David Elementary School - the largest of the four elementary schools. The enrollment at the Becky-David School before the year-round school was started was about 1200. Becky-David was non-graded prior to starting year-round education. The junior and senior high schools have a standard traditional curriculum.

The Problem

The rapid increase in population caused a critical need for 15 new classrooms in the Becky-David School. The school district was bonded to its capacity (no new money available for building). The alternatives for solving this problem were double sessions or the 4-quarter plan year round. The community rejected both these alternatives vehemently. The 9-3 Plan was suggested and the community seemed open to giving it a try. In summary, the most critical problem was a lack of space for kids and the lack of money to provide space.

Brief Summary of the 9-3 Plan

This plan entails kids going to school for 9 weeks and then having three weeks vacation and repeating this cycle all year round. The Becky-David School population is divided into four sessions called cycles. At any given time

during the year, three of these cycles are in school and one cycle is on its three-week vacation. As a result the capacity of the Becky-David School has been increased by 1/3 - that is, the Becky-David School which was capable of handling 1200 school children could now handle 1600 school children. The 15 additional classrooms did not have to be built onto the school in order to solve the increased enrollment problem.

Questions and Answers Arising in the Discussion Groups

1. Q. Do you have a basic problem scheduling and running the four cycles?

   A. After the initial problems, no.

2. Q. Did you have to increase your staff?

   A. No. Some teachers work the nine-week-three-week schedule along with the kids. Other teachers work nine-months and three-months as they had in the past. Other teachers work 10 months, 11 months, and some few are even working 12 months in a row. Where a teacher elects to work nine months and take three months off or 10 months and take two months off, we are able to provide staff in place of them from our other elementary school personnel who want to work in the summer.

3. Q. How do you pay the teachers who work extra time?

   A. We figure the per dieum based upon the standard 180 day requirement in Missouri and multiply that per dieum by the number of extra days they elect to work during the year.

4. Q. Can the nine-week-three-week teachers go to summer school?

   A. No. This is a problem, but we have found that in our area the evening programs of courses in education are as good or better than the summer ones.

5. Q. How many days of instruction do the kids get during the year?

   A. 174

6. Q. Are your primary (1-3) and intermediate (4-6) grades on the same schedule?

   A. Yes. the only exception is that all of the teachers in the primary grades work on a nine-week-three-week schedule. The primary grades are self-contained classrooms, and we feel it best that the children are able to stay with one teacher at all times.

7. Q. Does this mean that the children in grades 4-6 meet a lot of different teachers during the year?

A. No more than they would have prior to this year-round plan. These children have three different teachers and when they repeat the cycle they come back to the same three teachers.

8. Q. How about the heat of the summer?

A. This was a big problem - so big that we have to air condition the school at substantial cost. This cost is expected to run about ½ of the cost of building 15 new classrooms.

9. Q. Do you find that materials wear out faster?

A. Yes, but we probably will use them a little bit longer than we would have under the old system.

10. Q. Were extensive curriculum changes required?

A. No. Our program is no different than it was in the past. We do feel, however, that the nine-week-three-week cycle lends itself better to our non-graded continuous progress system than did the nine-month-three-month standard system.

11. Q. Does this plan promote either acceleration or enrichment?

A. No, not particularly.

12. Q. Can children elect any other program than this 9-3 program?

A. No, it is totally inflexible as far as this goes.

13. Q. Has the fine arts program suffered as a result of this change?

A. No.

14. Q. How did you divide the student population into the four cycles?

A. We first divided the Becky-David population area into four geographic sections. This meant that in most cases neighborhoods (and thus friends) would be going to school on the same cycle. Secondly, we made sure that children in family units would not be separated by the cycles.

15. Q. Did you include the students in helping to plan this program?

A. Yes, even though they were elementary kids they were involved in frequent discussions about the change.

16. Q. How much was the school capacity increased?

A. The Becky-David School has 45 classrooms with 60 classes of kids.

17. Q. How much planning time would you recommend to a school district which might want to do this sort of thing?

A. It is difficult to say - probably two years. But I feel that it is possible to over do the planning and talk too much without action.

18. Q. Do you give grades in your school?

A. No.

19. Q. Has attendance been affected?

A. It is essentially the same even though we were warned that it would drop significantly. This warning came from the Missouri State Department of Education and it was an important concern since we are reimbursed according to average daily attendance.

20. Q. How were your administrators affected?

A. Besides the initial extra work involved in planning and implementing the program they were given an 11 month contract with 12 months of school responsibility. In other words, the administrator is supposed to take a month's vacation while school is in session. This has been impractical so far. I feel it is unfair to the administrators.

21. Q. How do the kids like this system?

A. They are taking to it with varying degrees of enthusiasm. There really doesn't seem to be any outstanding reactions one way or another.

22. Q. How do your teachers like this system?

A. Of all the people involved they are the most enthusiastic.

23. Q. What has been the parents' reaction to this system?

A. About 60 percent enthusiastic and about 40 percent unenthusiastic. There are varying degrees of enthusiasm and unenthusiasm. There have been problems for the parents such as scheduling vacations, providing babysitters for working mothers and coordinating the elementary school childrens' schedules with those of the secondary school children. But there has been a surprising lack of violent rejection to this system.

24. Q. Did you spend much time in discussion with the community about this plan before you started it?

A. Yes, we used PTA's coffee hours, and informal parent gatherings extensively.

25. Q. Has student achievement changed for the better?

A. An evaluation done by the University of Missouri showed no significant change. However, the teachers feel that the children are doing better.

26. Q. Has your school district saved much money as a result of this?

A. A financial evaluation by the University of Missouri indicates that this is not particularly a money saving system.

27. Q. How is this year-round plan going to work when you have to do it in the secondary schools?

A. I think it can be done but it will be enormously more complicated and right now I cannot answer specifically. I think it can be accomplished. It seems that many of the objectives are in the areas of extracurricular activities, support programs, summer work for older kids, etc. I think these problems will not be too difficult to overcome. There is no question that implementing a plan like this would require rather extensive curricular changes in the secondary schools. This will be a problem. You must remember that our elementary school was already non-graded - we had developed a continuous progress curriculum which lends itself very well to the flexibility of kids stopping and starting. The secondary schools are not that way and something significant would have to change in this area.

28. Q. Did you handle your scheduling by computer or manually?

A. Manually, but I am sure if secondary schools were involved you would have to use a computer.

29. Q. Is the school ever closed down for any period of time?

A. Yes. The standard two weeks at Christmas, one week in the spring, standard vacation days, and about a week in June depending on the number of snow days taken during the winter.

30. Q. What do you think is the most serious criticism of your program the way it exists?

A. There are a couple. First, it is not too good to have the school district on two different systems - that is, secondary and elementary on different schedules. Secondly, our program is inflexible in a way. The children are put in a cycle and that is it. Also, tight scheduling contributes to the program becoming a little too tense.

31. Q. What would you say are the greatest benefits of your system?

A. First of all, it is obvious that we solved a problem that we could not have except by worse systems such as double sessions or the four-quarter plan. Secondly, the system has made better

our continuous progress curriculum. In addition, it is good that the teachers like this and are happy with it. Another unexpected benefit has been with the use of the three-week vacation period as a time for special remedial help or tutoring - not on a required or pressure basis but on a voluntary help basis.

33. Q. Where could we get some printed material on your program?

A. Write to me:

Mr. Alan M. O'Dell
Administrative Assistant
Elementary Education
Francis Howell School District
Route #2
St. Charles, Missouri 63301

FLEXIBLE ALL-YEAR PLAN, WILSON SCHOOL, MANKATO STATE COLLEGE

Dr. Donald Glines
Director

Moderator: Ernest Johnson

Reported by Thomas J. Jachimowicz

The concept of the flexible year-round school will be accepted and well on the way to nationwide adoption by 1980, if we are patient and continue to provide national leadership to the movement. There appears to be little doubt that in 1971 such a trend is developing. In the meantime, there are two frustrations: (1) Those who want such a program right now are currently fighting against the odds; and (2) unfortunately, no year-round program in operation yet provides complete answers. Therefore, needed immediately is a strong commitment from more educational and lay leaders that the concept of the year-round school makes tremendous sense even in 1971. We must see that new relevant plans are created and implemented; basic year-round school blueprints must be developed with much more flexibility than provided in present plans so that the ideas can more readily be modified and utilized rapidly in any district throughout the United States.

The 45-15 plan is not the answer, nor is the quarter system, nor the multiple trails plan, nor the Wilson plan, nor any other now in operation or on paper. None meets the needs of most communities. The current Wilson model comes closer to the ultimate in curriculum and flexibility, but it presently lacks the mechanisms to handle space and budget crises. The 45-15 solves immediate building problems, but is of otherwise little value if the curriculum does not drastically change. Similar comments could be made about all such current efforts. What is needed is to take the best of the existing operational or paper proposals and develop some combinations that more nearly reach toward the ultimate. These plans must be ones that can be adopted by segments of the community almost overnight. The two and three year studies of districts such as have been conducted in several Michigan communities have been necessary and valuable in the initial stages, but if every district must repeat three year feasibility studies, the movement will still be struggling in the year 2000. What is dramatically needed now are immediate action implementation efforts in many states.

The year-round school must provide more options and alternatives for students than presently available in the monopolistic police state neighborhood public schools. Not all students, parents, and teachers should be forced into the same mold in the district; otherwise, the new efforts will be a repetition of the mistakes made in developing the present conventional school systems.

The year-round movement is mandatory for both "traditional" and "innovative" school patterns. But if we are ever to develop truly humane schools, where individual persons are really given actual personal consideration, then the all year school is an absolute necessity. For example, in Minnesota temperatures of minus 30, heavy snowfall, blowing snow, and high drifts are not uncommon during the winter. Many Minnesota families would like to take their vacation in January or February. For some, such as the carpenter, this is the ideal time, when the construction industry is forced to a slowdown by the weather. But if a family is locked into a conventional school system, can they take a leisurely trip to Florida during the winter? Of course not! My goodness, a seven-year-old just could not possibly afford to miss two months of those wonderful 2-2 basal readers, nor could a 17-year-old miss two months of United States History. The only way they escape is by penalties, make-up work, summer school, and all the other negative responses. The usual pattern, then, is for the family to stay home. But are schools in Florida any better? Can students there go to Minnesota for snowmobiling, ice skating, ice fishing, skiing, and other outdoor winter activities? Absolutely not! The required Florida curriculum, credits, and attendance regulations are generally as rigid as those in Minnesota so that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, for a student to be gone large amounts of time between September and June, and still "pass" to the next grade level, especially in districts which fail to provide extensive summer school opportunities.

Unfortunately, the nine month schools labeled "innovative" have not done much better than "conventional" schools in this respect. Modular scheduling, team teaching, open facility construction, independent study, nongrading, efforts at individualizing instruction, self-pacing, concern over the affective domain, revised curriculum content, new materials from publishers, hand developed teacher packets, and so many more such elements have been in most cases sincere efforts to improve education. In many situations better programs have evolved, but unfortunately, the majority of these efforts have not been of enough value to show significant improvement. One of the major difficulties is that schools have adopted only a few of the changes available to them. There must be massive adoption in a school, as all of the above-mentioned "innovative gimmicks" weave together. One can seldom really succeed without the other; and as practically none of the flexible team schools which have gained a national reputation have instituted year-round programs, they really are not completely humane schools. They have left out an essential ingredient for a creative, exciting, individualized environment.

Innovative schools--at least schools that dramatically break the pattern of the conventional North American School organization of self-contained elementary rooms and 55 minute period high schools--are relatively easy to start. It takes dissatisfaction--the school must improve; it takes commitment--we can develop a better approach; it takes self confidence--we can solve problems as they arise; and it takes hard work--the willingness to endure many 26-hour days in the initial efforts of each revision.

The most important factor, though, is a belief in options--in alternatives. Every school district must provide alternative learning and environmental styles for individual students, teachers, and parents. Few districts in the

United States have done this, and as a result the neighborhood police state has continued even in liberal communities. The general pattern for years has been to force everyone to go to the neighborhood school--which unfortunately was organized just like every other neighborhood school. Even if it were different, students in that area of the district were still forced into one mold. It is essential that we provide for options. If this is done, innovative, humane, year-round schools can be developed overnight in every community. If the insistence remains on "sameness," not only is change made terribly difficult, but in addition, the monopolistic pattern of requiring students to go to one school, follow one pattern of requirements, and spend three months in a summer lockout will continue.

There are three easy ways to break the community lockstep of conventional or innovative ninemonth schools. Obviously there are more than three, but these patterns offer easily illustrated, practical, immediately operational examples. The logistics, mechanisms, salesmanship problems vary from district to district depending upon size and other community factors. However, these "models" can be modified to work in almost every district in the United States.

Probably the easiest way to start an open innovative year-round school is to do as was done at Wilson. One school in the district was made an open attendance area for the entire city. In other words, one school became a volunteer enrollment program so that those students, parents, and teachers who could best fit in an open flexible school could enroll. Those who preferred the conventional mold were allowed to stay in that environment. The two things wrong yet in Mankato are that another Wilson has not yet been formed, for Wilson has a waiting list, and second that there is no middle-of-the road school. Each district needs one or more open, middle-of-the-road, and conventional structured school approaches, for in 1971 some students fit best into these various molds. In addition, the public schools need to offer small "free" school opportunities for students who work best where they can create their own environment. This can be done simply by renting a big house, for example. Further, in large districts with many extremely aliented youth, a Person Center must be established--where human relations, social awareness, and rehabilitation efforts are the focus. But all districts, regardless of size, must have at least open, moderate, and structured opportunities if true individualization is to take place. One way to do it then is for one entire school to become open, one moderate, and one structured, and then allow students to attend the school of their choice.

Another way to accomplish the same alternatives is to develop the school-within-a-school concept. It retains the neighborhood flavor, avoids transportation problems, provides easy change from one program to another, and breaks large schools into smaller units. It can even be done in a small school where only a few teachers and students are available for the program. The disadvantages are conflicts among faculty over philosophy and the sharing of special facilities.

A third method is to develop an open Wilson style program, but with options within it. As students enroll they can choose to operate all or some of their program in Option 1--a completely free atmosphere where they can pretty much do what they want, only obeying the stop signs and speed limits of the school; or they can choose Option 2, which might be a similar open, flexible model but with

more restrictions such as quarterly evaluations; Option 3 could be planned program where daily the student and advisor interact to determine a possible schedule for that day; Option 4 could be a closed approach, where in some or all subjects the student would be expected to report as scheduled and engage in prescribed work. This then gives each student individual options varying from complete openness to fairly tight structure. However, to make this work, the school must have an open flexible organization which will allow for all these alternatives. Another approach is for a district to follow an already developed model, such as the one proposed by the National Association of Secondary School Principals under the direction of Dr. J. Lloyd Trump.

Perhaps the best way to encourage schools to venture into open, humane year-round approaches to education is to briefly describe the efforts at Wilson. This is not the best school in the country. It is a small school with many problems, but is has been a success story in the overnight achievement of immediate dramatic change. Relating some of these efforts should encourage others to start, or continue their own present innovative efforts, or to lead the way far beyond those attempted at Wilson. The following description will be brief. Those who are interested in complete detail are referred to the revised edition of Implementing Different and Better Schools, by Don Glines, now titled Creating Humane Schools. (Campus Publishers, Box 1005, Mankato, Minnestoa, 1971, $5.00.)

Much of what Wilson has to offer the nation is an example of how rapid, massive change can occur in a school. In July, 1968, Wilson was a good conventional school with a self-contained elementary section, and a 55-minute period hall pass, bell ringing, study hall type of high school section. Report cards were given, the school was a neighborhood attendance area, the facilities were eggcrate, the staff was hired, the budget was set, the special education students were separated, and there were dress codes, attendance regulations, athletic eligibility rules, and all the rest of the ritual that clutters up most schools in the United States. By September of 1968, in two short months, all this had changed to a new philosophy. Implementation factors and refinements have continued to change and imrpove, but the approach was achieved in a very short period of time. It is now in its third year, still struggling, and still trying to find some answers.

In summarizing current results, certainly the human relations factors have become vital keys. Students select their own teachers/adults/persons/motivators/guides; they select their own study experiences--no "courses" are required. The school believes the affective domain is the most important, followed by the psychomotor, and then the cognitive. Therefore, in the early years of school, for example, self-image and success are most important, and physical education, home economics, and industrial arts are more important than reading and math. The cognitive comes easily if the affective and psychomotor domains are in good shape.

However, the cognitive must be self paced and/or individualized for each student. Individualization can easily include 1-1 conference, open lab, independent study, small groups of 5-6, and occasionally a common thread large group. Discovering relevant meaningful materials, the process of learning, and learning that learning can be fun are much more important than prescribed

teacher and/or textbook content. Individualization makes greater provision for creativity and learning styles.

At Wilson there is optional attendance and open campus for all. The school is completely nongraded--"kindergarten" age students mingle and study with "senior" age students. There are no dress codes, attendance notes from home, study halls, bells, or other such nonsense. Each day a new smorgasbord schedule is developed, based opon the needs of individuals and groups for that day. There are no report cards, even for seniors, and state course requirements for graduation are not followed. No credits, class ranks, grade point averages, or other badges of discrimination are given.

Every effort is being made to interrelate curricula; teams such as the Expressive, Systems, Environmental, and Communication have been formed to break down subject discipline and grade separation. Teachers "teach" or "learn" in another area of the school at least one day a week. Thus a former math teacher now in the Systems Team might work in the Environmental Team one day a week, one time "teaching" in traditional home economics areas and the next time "learning" in industrial arts. The physical environment has been enhanced by carpets, plants, animals, and bright colors. Early childhood programs, open athletic eligibility, mixing of the special and regular students, sending students to Mexico, and other such steps have been taken to enhance the chances of success.

The above-sketched chances thus permitted the development of a more humane year-round school. Individualization, self-pacing, optional attendance, choice of studies, and the other 64 or so revisions made at Wilson provided the avenues for students to plug in, plug out, speed up, slow down, start, stop, and continue whenever they so desire. Thus a student can start typing on a Thursday in November and work at his own pace and program until December. He can then leave and go to Florida for January and February, returning in March to continue his typing right on through July, August, and September if he desires. There are no worries about finishing by June, registering in September, failing to receive a credit, or other. Students can graduate early; there is no need for many of the students to sit through 175 days for four years just to get a diploma.

There should be a Wilson type program in every community, but there should be programs with more structure for those who cannot handle the degree of decision-making and responsibility. Either one or more entire schools, or the school-within-a-school, or the free, open, planned, and closed options within the individualized year-round school should be available to all students. Thus this discussion about the need for more humane year-round schools, and the mechanisms for achieving them, ultimately must lead to one basic question: Where are we headed in the future?

Obviously the answers are not simple, but in trying to analyze long-range developments, the crystal ball reflection offered here at this moment in time is that more and more communities are going to offer Wilson type alternatives. More and more are going to offer year-round schools, taking the flexibility of the Wilson approach in individualization and combining it with space and cost factors so carefully considered in some of the other present year-round approaches.

The school in the community and the lighted school will become accepted parts of the year-round school movement. More money will be spent in the areas of research and evaluation. No longer can we continue to spend only one quarter of one percent of the national education budget on research. The evaluation which takes place will stress the affective and psychomotor domains as the cognitive. No longer will achievement tests in so-called basic skills subjects continue to cloud the accountability issue. The former "non-academic" subjects will gain par with the presently labeled "important" subjects. Curriculum efforts will be interrelated; separate subjects and departments will be eliminated.

Perhaps most important of all, if the above are to succeed, is the complete reorganization of college and university education in its totality. The archaic college structures no longer can survive. They are being attacked at every angle; the movement is just beginning, but in ten years, great strides will have been taken. Many of the federally sponsored government model teacher education programs will be operational.

To show that this is happening, even schools such as Mankato State are moving. The college has just abolished the grade of F. Many courses can be taken on a pass/no-credit basis. In teacher education, the ridiculous ten or twelve department structure that has paralyzed teacher education and teacher certification for years (elementary, secondary, educational administration, educational psychology, and other such department misnomers) is being scrapped. At Mankato State College, the ten isolated departments are being replaced by four interrelated centers.

As part of one of these centers, the program for conceptual and evolving ideas is operationalizing in September a freshman through graduate open, flexible, year-round individualized teacher and administrator education program patterned after the Wilson model. If successful it could help provide the push for some immediately operational revolutions in teacher education and ultimately a redesign of the old ivy towers of tradition.

Will all this be successful nationally? If you look at 1970, the answer is no. Education nationally has been in an actionless plateau. The dramatic reorganizations of the 60's--team teaching, flexible scheduling, nongrading, and all, have leveled off. Now we are in a period of talking, planning, and frustration. Little seems to be happening. But if we can look ahead to 1980, there should be clearly visible an entirely new design in education emerging. It takes patience to wait until 1980, but to reach that vision, it also takes action during the 70's.

We can probably best summarize that need for action by quoting from one of John F. Kennedy's most memorable addresses. Speaking about the atomic control treaty, Kennedy said: "But history and our own conscience will judge us harshly if we do not make every effort to test our hopes by action. According to an ancient Chinese proverb, 'a journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step.' And if that journey is 1,000 miles or even more, let history record, that we, in this land, at this time, took that first step."

Here then is clearly the call. We must accept that challenge related to immediate action implementation of the year-round school in communities all

over the U.S. We must stop the philosophy of the past 30 years which has said, "We would like to, but....". No longer can we make excuses. No longer can we let such a tone stifle education in the United States. Instead we need to say, "What are the priorities; what are the steps that we can immediately take to start....."

We as educators must now accept the challenge. We must state: "Let history record that we in this land, at this time, took that first step along the 1,000 miles ahead toward the success of the year-round school. History and our own conscience will judge us harshly if we do not make every effort to test our hopes by action." We all have the obligation to look toward 1972 with heads held high, and with the ability to say that we took that first step--that we do have the start of the year-round school underway in every state, and ultimately, in the years ahead, in every district. We must test our beliefs by action.

SECOND GENERAL SESSION*

Presiding: John L. Kennedy
Director, Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation, Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Question and Answer Panel Session
Panel Chairman: Donald M. Carroll, Jr., Assistant Commissioner of Basic Education, Programs and Services, Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Reactor Panel: Sami J. Alam, Director for Research and Evaluation, Port Huron, Michigan.

John Buch, Assistant County Superintendent, Chester County, Pennsylvania.

Don Glines, Director, Wilson School, Mankato State College.

George Glinke, Administrative Assistant for Year-Round School Study, Utica, Michigan.

Oz Johnson, Assistant Superintendent for Research, Jefferson County, Kentucky.

John D. McLain, Director, Research-Learning Center, Clarion State College.

Alan M. O'Dell, Administrator of Elementary Education, St. Charles, Missouri

* Transcripts of these presentations were unavailable for inclusion in this report.

CONCURRENT SESSIONS

Tuesday, February 9, 1971

Section 1: Design Your Own Plan*
Host Moderator: John D. McLain, Director, Research-Learning Center, Clarion State College

How To Individualize Instruction

Section 2: Individualizing Math and Science
Fred Stewart, Math-Science Coordinator, Neshaminy School District.
Host Moderator: Benjamin D. Hengst, Bureau of Administrative Leadership Service, Specialist, Pennsylvania Department of Education.

Section 3: Computer Assisted Instruction
David G.Leckvarcik, Chairman, Math Department, Altoona School District
Frank Rosenhoover, Math Teacher, Altoona High School
Host Moderator: H. Stanley Wills, Director of Basic Education, Pennsylvania State Education Association.

Section 4: Individualized Self-Selected Secondary Program*
Raymond Holden, Teacher, The Secondary School Individualized Curriculum, Wilson School, Mankato State College.
Host Moderator: Edward Grissinger, Superintendent, Jim Thorpe Area Schools, Jim Thorpe, Pennsylvania.

Section 5: Individualized Self-Selected Elementary Program
Orville Jensen, Teacher, The Elementary School Individualized Curriculum, Wilson School, Mankato State College
Host Moderator: Everett Landin, Director, Educational Development Center, West Chester State College.

Section 6: Individualizing Reading*
Christopher R. Mare, Coordinator of Reading, State College Area School District, State College, Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Thelma G. Kaufman, Reading Consultant, State College Area School District, State College, Pennsylvania.
Host Moderator: Don Means, Assistant Director, Educational Development Center, Research-Learning Center, Clarion State College

* Transcripts of these presentations were unavailable for inclusion in this report.

INDIVIDUALIZING MATH AND SCIENCE

Fred Stewart
Math-Science Coordinator
Neshaminy School District

Moderator: Benjamin D. Hengst

Introduction

Mr. Stewart has been a classroom teacher, department chairman, and now serves as the district mathematics-science coordinator in the Neshaminy School District, Bucks County, Pennsylvania. Also he has taught off campus courses in mathematics for Pennsylvania State University and is presently on the evening division staff at Trenton State, New Jersey.

Mr. Stewart participated in the piloting of the University of Illinois mathematics program for the academic and the underachiever student. He has served the last several years on the writing staff of the Regional Educational Laboratory of the Carolinas and Virginia for the writing of the Individualized mathematics system.

Mr. Stewart's Remarks

Individualized Instruction: With the introduction of the year-round school, we must not only change our school calendars but our curriculum. In the past few sessions you have been exposed to various proposals on year-round education. We are caught in a dichotomy between the subject and the students in many respects. This should not be! Why can't we provide a variable pace for the individual student? Algebra I would not end in June but when a student has progressed through a series of predetermined tasks.

There are several prototypes of such programs that I have in mind. The one would be the IPI mathematics program under the auspices of Research for Better Schools. This serves as a model for the elementary schools and at present attempts are being made for introduction of programs at the junior high level, i.e., ISCS and A-W. To my knowledge, public acceptance of these programs has been less than spectacular.

These programs are definitely a step in the right direction. However, remember a few years ago? We were swept off our feet by an idea that was going to revolutionize the classroom. I am thinking of Programmed Text and related materials. What has happened to this educational approach? Didn't each student participate at his own pace? Is this the missing link? I certainly think it is important and has many merits but it is not the answer in itself. Will the same fate befall the IPI movement?

The main drawback in schools utilizing many of these ideas is related to cost and the fact that a steady diet of any one type of instruction often has a way of turning the students off.

How can we overcome some of these problems and begin to modify our programs while at the same time we plan to live within our budgets? Maybe you don't have budgetary problems! I offer you the following for your consideration:

1. Grouping and scheduling of students
2. Flexible teacher assignments
3. Prescription writing for students
4. Improved use of student teachers
5. Student tutorial program

I would like to think that each of these would allow the school to modify the existing structure so that you can provide individual help to students who need it. I helped to initiate such a program in the school district that I was with prior to my move to my present position. The Council Rock Intermediate School in Richboro, Pennsylvania, is continuing on such a program under the able direction of Mrs. Ethel Tripple, the math department chairman.

I would like to briefly describe how we altered our program to more closely meet the needs of our students.

1. Grouping and scheduling of students
   Very important to reschedule students as units of learning and/or topics change.
2. Flexible teacher assignments
   Part-time teachers
   Teacher Aides
   Teacher rotation within a teaching team
3. Prescriptions for students
   BO's are vital in this area. This permits you to write out prescriptions in order to meet the objectives.
4. Improved use of student teachers
   Very poor use at present.
   This year's student teacher is next year's teacher
5. Student tutorial service
   Provide situations for students to help each other.

These are not meant to provide a panacea for the educational problems but I do believe that they will help us help children and this, after all, is our main purpose.

COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION

David G. Leckvarcik
Chairman, Math Department
Altoona School District

Moderator: H. Stanley Wills

I. Undesirable Use of the Computer.

A. Using it as a toy

1. Not allowed to "play" with it unless you have a certain grade average. (Perhaps alright to keep students in class at certain times but computer may be the only inspiration some students have.

B. Everyone must hand in a computer program each working period. (Regardless of whether relevant or not.)

1. Results in the teacher seeing 12 to 20 different programs a year from 150 students. (They trade after everyone writes one. Does use a lot of machine time.)

C. Teaching Computer Science and placing mathematics education in the background.

1. Not all mathematical concepts lend themselves to programming. (E.g., proof, statement problems.)

2. Or the extremely difficult program makes the simple mathematical concept or procedure unattainable. (E.g., factoring a binomial.) Teach things in their simplest form.

II. Desirable Use of the Computer.

A. As an educational tool the computer and computer programming is a concrete example of the abstract.

1. Helps present certain abstract concepts in a memorable way. Example: Matrix-Matrix Inversion, Compound Interest.

B. To indicate the essential factors, terms, etc. that make a certain method work; e.g., Computer Program to Solve a System of Linear Equations in Two Variables.

C. To generate an <u>easy</u> path to advanced concepts.

1. Example, "A computer program to solve a system of n equations in n variables."

D. To encourage individual programming and mathematical talent.

1. An after-school availability of the computer with supervision.

a. If a student is interested in improving on a program considered class. Example: a student of mine was interested in writing a better program for finding the prime factorization of a number - the one we did in class merely listed all the factors in repetitive form, for example $12 = 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 3$ - he spent several days rewriting the program to list the factors in exponential form.

b. To extend mathematical interest. Example: a student after studying area may be interested in finding the area under a Parabolic Curve. This involved the elementary concepts of analysis. He may extend this to volume. The program is relatively simple - the concept is advanced.

Summary:

The computer must not be used as toy or as the solution but somewhere in between as an educational tool that helps present and categorize mathematical procedures and concepts in a memorable fashion.

INDIVIDUALIZATION OF MATH - SCIENCE INSTRUCTION THROUGH COMPUTER RELATED INSTRUCTION

Frank Rosenhoover
Math Teacher
Altoona High School

Moderator: H. Stanley Wills

This presentation was given in two parts and this report deals with a description of the computer systems and their uses in the Altoona Area School District.

I. Equipment in operation

A. Altoona Area High School

1. GE 215 Computer

2. Data net 30

3. Card punch, card sorter and various other pieces of peripheral equipment

4. Remote teletype terminals

B. Altoona Area Vocational-Technical School

1. Honeywell Computer

2. Data processing class laboratories

C. Selected schools in the tri-county area have remote terminal teletype outlets.

II. Uses of the computer systems

A. Non-instructional

1. Industrial payrolls and inventories on a rental basis.

2. Used by the Altoona School District for:

a. Payroll
b. Attendance
c. Report cards
d. Inventory

e. Personnel files
f. Tax billing and accounting

B. Educational Uses

1. Computer Technology

a. Both the AASD and the AAVTSD offer courses in computer programming as vocational training. The Vo-Tech course is more directly vocation oriented.

b. The Vo-Tech school offers courses in data processing and related occupations.

2. Computer Assisted Instruction

All secondary math and science teachers are encouraged to supplement their courses with computer use in the solution of problems and to expand certain concepts through computer related instruction.

Separate rooms are equipped with teletype machines and can be used not only during class time but during study periods and before and after school. Students are encouraged to use these facilities at any time.

Certain advanced elementary students are also using the computer in their specialized courses of study.

Selected secondary schools in the tri-county area rent teletypes and computer time to aid their students in mathematics and science classes.

Educational uses of the computer must be used as secondary approaches and aids in the instruction of math and science. Emphasis should be placed on the students' use of non-classroom time to pursue their assigned as well as unassigned goals.

INDIVIDUALIZED SELF-SELECTED ELEMENTARY PROGRAM

Orville Jensen
Teacher, Wilson School
Mankato State College

Moderator: Dr. Everett Landin

Reported by Leann Miller

Discussion about the Wilson School Program touched on many areas, among them the following:

The Wilson School has about 500-600 students ranging in age from four years to high school seniors. It is a laboratory school of Mankato State College but is part of the 6000-pupil public school system of Mankato, Minnesota. It is a non-graded, team-teaching program in which the school is open all but about 25 to 30 days a year. Children must attend at least 180 days in one year but many attend more days. Teachers schedule vacations during quarters. Enrollment in the school is by application and the administration chooses students primarily on the basis of maintaining a socio-economic mix. While the research potential is high for the school, there is no money available for extensive studies.

Teams of teachers cross all grade levels and are divided into four areas: Mathematics, communications, environmental studies (social studies, science, home economics, industrial arts) and expressive (arts). The three-five year-olds have a more definite "home base" than other ages and are under more careful supervision.

In this third year, the school's reporting system has evolved into a five-copy sheet on which students, in cooperation with their advisors, set subject area goals. Later, each student's work is evaluated on the basis of these goals and comments can be noted on the sheet. Copies are sent to advisor, parents (if they desire to have them), teachers and a central file. Standardized tests are also used--Iowa, Stanford, Metropolitan or California--even though they may not fit the school's goals.

Graduates of the school have been accepted at all colleges to which they have applied, although several were skeptical of the preparation and asked for usual letter grades, which were supplied by a panel of teachers through a special evaluation.

SPEAKERS

SPEAKERS

Dr. Sami Alam, Director of Research, Port Huron Public Schools: Address: "How to Analyze Budgets for Year-Round Operation;" Reactor Panel member.

John Billman, Curriculum Development Specialist, Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation, Pennsylvania Department of Education: Moderator of workshop, "Analyzing Quality Education."

John Buch, Assistant County Superintendent, Chester County: Moderator of workshop, "How to Analyze Resources Needed for Year-Round Education;" Reactor Panel member.

Donald M. Carroll, Jr., Assistant Commissioner of Basic Education, Programs and Services, Pennsylvania Department of Education: Reactor Panel chairman.

Joseph Dunn, Curriculum Development Specialist, Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation, Pennsylvania Department of Education: Moderator of workshop, "Analyzing Living Patterns."

Dr. Don Glines, Director, Wilson School, Mankato State College: Consultant for discussion group, "Flexible All-Year Plan;" Reactor Panel member.

Dr. George Glinke, Administrative Assistant for Year-Round School Study, Utica, Michigan: Consultant for clinic, "How to Organize a Community Study on Year-Round Education;" Reactor Panel member.

Dr. John O. Hershey, President of the Milton S. Hershey School: Welcoming address.

Dr. B. Anton Hess, Deputy Secretary and Commissioner for Basic Education, Pennsylvania Department of Education: Address, "Remarks from the Department of Education."

Raymond Holden, Teacher, The Secondary School Individualized Curriculum, Wilson School, Mankato State College: Consultant for workshop, "Individualized Self-Selected Secondary Program."

Orville Jensen, Teacher, The Elementary School Individualized Curriculum, Wilson School, Mankato State College: Consultant for workshop, "Individualized Self-Selected Elementary Program."

Mrs. Thelma G. Kaufman, Reading Consultant, State College Area School District: Consultant for workshop, "Individualizing Reading."

John L. Kennedy, Director, Bureau of Curriculum Development and Evaluation, Pennsylvania Department of Education: Presided at Dinner Session.

Dr. David H. Kurtzman, Secretary, Pennsylvania Department of Education: "Greetings," Opening Banquet.

David G. Leckvarcik, Chairman, Math Department, Altoona School District: Consultant for workshop, "Computer Assisted Instruction."

Mervin F Manning, Assistant Comptroller, Bureau of School Accounting and State Subsidy, Pennsylvania Department of Education: Moderator of workshop "Analyzing Financial Implications."

Christopher R. Mare, Coordinator of Reading, State College Area School District: Consultant for workshop, "Indiviudalizing Reading."

Dr. John McLain, Director, Research-Learning Center, Clarion State College: Address "Year-Round Education in Transition: A Follow Up Report on the National Seminar's Position Paper;" Moderator of workshop "Design Your Own Plan;" and Reactor Panel member.

Alan M. O'Dell, Administrator of Elementary Education, St. Charles, Missouri: Consultant for workshop, "9-3 Plan;" Reactor Panel member.

Frank Rosenhoover, Math Teacher, Altoona High School: Consultant for workshop, "Computer Assisted Instruction."

Fred Stewart, Math-Science Coordinator, Neshaminy School District: Consultant for workshop, "Individualizing Math and Science."

H. Stanley Wills, Director of Basic Education, Pennsylvania State Education Association: Presided at Opening Banquet.

PARTICIPANTS

Mr. Michael A. Acceta
Chartiers Valley Schools
2053 Swallow Hill Road
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15220

Mr. Chester Angelo
Educational Development Center
Kutztown State College
Kutztown, Pennsylvania

Mr. Robert Z. Belles
Lake-Lehman School District
Lehman
Pennsylvvania 18627

Dr. Clarence T. Berner
Curriculum Development Specialist
Bureau of Curriculum Dev. and Eval.
Education Building Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Mr. William F. Bindrim, Jr.
P. O. Box 411
Buckingham
Pennsylvania 18912

Mr. Wayne Black
Rockwood Area Schools
Rockwood
Pennsylvania

Mr. Louis Bocian
Systems Analysis Division
Management Information Systems
Pennsylvania Department of Education
120 S. 27th Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Dr. Robert Bowser, Ass't Director
Bureau of Curriculum Dev. and Eval.
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Education Building Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Mr. Robert W. Boltz
Reading SchoolDistrict
Shillington
Pennsylvania

Mr. Lloyd J. Bresley
485 Grove Lane
King of Prussia
Pennsylvania 19406

Mr. John Brunette
Altoona Area Education Association
Altoona High School
Altoona, Pennsylvania

Mr. A. Eugene Case, Ass't Supt.
Troy Area Schools
Box 67
Troy, Pennsylvania 16947

Mr. Nicolas Colasanti
Owen J. Roberts School District
R.D. #1
Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464

Mr. Walter Corbett, Principal
Troy Area Junior High School
Box 67
Troy, Pennsylvania 16947

Mr. Delbert Corwin, President
Montrose Area School Board
Montrose Area School District
Montrose, Pennsylvania

Mr. James R. Crawford
Moon Schools
1407 Beers School Road
Coraopolis, Pennsylvania 15108

Mr. James A. Daly, Jr.
R.D. #1
Glenmoore
Pennsylvania

Mr. Robert Davis, Superintendent
Bedford Schools
Bedford
Pennsylvania

Mr. Leo A. DeSantis
Schuylkill Valley School District
Leesport
Pennsylvania 19533

Mr. Dawson Detwiler, Supv. Prin.
Claysburg-Kimmel Schools
Claysburg
Pennsylvania 16625

Mr. Calvin DiCarlo, Ass't Supt.
116 East Street
New Castle, Pennsylvania 16101

Mr. Eugene Desch
New Castle District Schools
116 East Street
New Castle, Pennsylvania 16101

Mr. Savero DonGiovanni
c/o Mr. Robert G. Harkins
5351 Elmwood Drive
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15227

Mr. Robert Dolbear, Prin.
Dallas Senior High School
Dallas
Pennsylvania

Mr. Oliver E. Dreese
Altoona Area High School
6th Avenue & 15th Street
Altoona, Pennsylvania 16602

Mr. Roger Dunning, Ass't Supt.
Stroudsburg Area Schools
901 King Street
Stroudsburg, Pennsylvania 18360

Miss Elizabeth Evans
721 Roselawn Avenue
Apt. C-1
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15228

Mr. Charles Fasold
Selinsgrove Jt. Area JSHS
Selinsgrove
Pennsylvania 17870

Mr. Ralph Furjanic
Harrisburg City Schools
Harrisburg
Pennsylvania 17105

Mr. Norman C. Furrer
5409 Colclesser Avenue
Altoona
Pennsylvania 16601

Miss Jane Garven
New Castle Area Schools
Lincoln Avenue
New Castle, Pennsylvania 16101

Ms. Betty Gensel
Dallas School District
Dallas
Pennsylvania

Mr. Glenn Gordon
New Castle Area Schools
Lincoln Avenue
New Castle, Pennsylvania 16101

Mrs. Geraldine Goss
Eastern York School District
72 West Market Street
Hellam, Pennsylvania 17406

Mr. Herbert Gibbs
Coordinator, Extended School Year
509 Burcham Drive
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Mr. John Gotaskie
6th and Walnut Streets
Sunbury
Pennsylvania

Mr. Robert J. Grenoble
New Cumberland
Pennsylvania

Mr. T. J. Griffiths, Jr.
Church Street
Moscow
Pennsylvania 18444

Mr. Robert H. Hacker
Montgomery County Schools
Montgomery County
Maryland

Mr. Robert G. Harkins
5351 Elmwood Drive
Pittsburgh
Pennsylvania 15227

Mr. Matthew J. Harris, Jr., Coordinator
Information Systems Design
Bureau of Curriculum Development and Eval.
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Education Building Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Mr. Johnie E. Harris
Montgomery County Schools
Montgomery County
Maryland

Dr. Robert Hays
Bensalem Township School District
3330 Humeville Road
Cornwells Heights, Pennsylvania

Mr. John G. Heagy
Cornwall Middle School
Cornwall
Pennsylvania 17016

Mr. Fred Heddinger, Executive Director
Penna. School Board Association, Inc.
410 North Third Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17101

Dr. Harold E. Hench
West Shore School District
1000 Hummel Avenue
Lemoyne, Pennsylvania 17043

Mr. George B. Hershey, Jr., Elem. Supv.
Lampeter-Strawburg School District
1949 Willow Street Pike
Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17602

Dr. Richard B. Hoffman
Greenville Senior High School
Greenville
Pennsylvania 16125

Mr. Joseph Hojak
Education Evaluation Adviser
Bureau of Curriculum Dev. and Eval.
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Education Building Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Dr. John R. Holliday, Supt. of Schools
Franklin Regional School District
3925 Reed Boulevard
Murrysville, Pennsylvania 15668

Mr. Leroy H. Hollingsworth, Prin.
Eastern High School
Eastern York School District
72 West Market Street
Hellam, Pennsylvania 17406

Mr. James F. Howell, Prin.
Middleburg High School
Middleburg
Pennsylvania

Mr. Albert B. Jacobs
Ass't for Secondary Instruction
Wissaukickon School District
Ambler, Pennsylvania

Mr. Charles E. James, President
Northern Tioga School District
Ilkland
Pennsylvania

Mr. David H. Johnston
Radnor School District
South Wayne Avenue
Wayne, Pennsylvania 19087

Mr. William E. Johnston, Principal
Clearfield Sr. High School
Clearfield
Pennsylvania 16830

Mr. Richard J. Jones
Director of Secondary Education
Indiana Area SchoolDistrict
501 East Pike
Indiana, Pennsylvania 15701

Mr. Joseph J. Kelly, Elem. Dir.
East Pennsboro Area School District
West Creek Hills Elem. Building
Erford Road
Camp Hill, Pennsylvania 17011

Mr. Willis L. Kennedy
Education Building
47 W. Beau Street
Washington, Pennsylvania 15301

Dr. John W. Khouri
44 West Wheeling Street
Washington
Pennsylvania 15301

Mr. Norman E. Kline, Principal
West Snyder High School
Beaver Springs
Pennsylvania

Dr. Joseph Lagana, Director
Secondary Education
North Allegheny School District
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Mr. Stanley K. Landis, Jr.
Owen J. Roberts School District
R.D. #1
Pottstown, Pennsylvania 19464

Mr. Frank Lewis
N. Tioga School District
Tioga
Pennsylvania

Mrs. Harold Lehmer
Pennsylvania PTA representative
Lone Lane Farm
Box 43, R.D. #2
Hummelstown, Pennsylvania 17036

Mr. William Magill, Principal
Annville-Cleona High School
South White Oak Street
Annville, Pennsylvania 17003

Dr. Donald G. Marcotte
Gateway Public Schools
Mosside Blvd.
Monroeville, Pennsylvania 15146

Mr. H. P. Martz
Reynolds School District
Greenville
Pennsylvania

Mr. Howard H. Master, Supt.
Snyder County Public Schools
Middleburg
Pennsylvania

Mr. Robert O. Mathias
521 Oxford Blvd.
Pittsburgh
Pennsylvania 15243

Mr. Robert McCarter
West Chester Area Schools
West Chester
Pennsylvania 19380

Mr. Holmes F. McCormick, Jr., Supt.
Montrose Area School District
Montrose
Pennsylvania

Mrs. Enid McGinnis
410 S. Meadowcroft Ave.
Pittsburgh
Pennsylvania 15228

Mrs. Leann Miller
Bureau of Curriculum Development and Eval.
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Education Building Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Mr. Richard Moyer
Conneaut Lake Schools
Conneaut Lake
Pennsylvania

Mr. George W. Myers
113 Locust Lane
Willow Street
Pennsylvania

Dr. Carl A. Newman, Supt.
North Allegheny School District
Pittsburgh
Pennsylvania

Mr. Carl M. Payne, Supt.
Eastern York School District
72 West Market Street
Hellam, Pennsylvania 17406

Mr. William G. Pettibon
Director of Higher Education, PSEA
400 N. Third Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Mr. Cy Ramsey
3700 Seventh Avenue
Altoona
Pennsylvania 16002

Dr. Harris W. Reynolds
Education Evaluation Specialist
Bureau of Curriculum Development and Eval.
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Education Building Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Mr. John Resetar
Education Evaluation Specialist
Bureau of Curriculum Dev. and Eval.
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Education Building Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Mr. John Reitz
Wilson School District
West Lawn
Pennsylvania

Mr. Paul M. Ricker
Ass't Supt. Prin.
Dover School
Dover, Pennsylvania 17315

Mr. Russell S. Roddy
Court House
Huntingdon
Pennsylvania

Mr. Daniel A. Rohrbach
County Superintendent
Berks County Schools
Courthouse, 11th floor
Reading, Pennsylvania 19601

Dr. Jack Roush
Fox Chapel Area Schools
611 Field Club Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15238

Mr. Judson Ruch, Chairman
Act 80 Advisory Committee
Eastern School District
72 West Market Street
Hellam, Pennsylvania 17406

Mr. L. Lloyd Ruoss
Superintendent
Fleetwood Area School District
Fleetwood, Pennsylvania 19522

Dr. Samuel M. Sanzotto
Bensalem Township School District
3330 Hulmeville Road
Cornwells Heights, Pennsylvania 19020

Dr. Robert H. Saylor
543 South 6th Street
Indiana
Pennsylvania 15701

Mr. Harry Seyler
Curriculum Development Specialist
Bureau of Curriculum Development
and Evaluation
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Education Building, 502 Box 911
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Mr. Daniel S. Shaheen
Montgomery County Schools
Montgomery County
Maryland

Dr. W. T. Shannon
Education Center
10 S. Waverly Street
Shillington, Pennsylvania 19607

Dr. H. Curwen Schlosser, Supt.
Upper Darby Twp. School District
Lansdowne Avenue & School Lane
Upper Darby, Pennsylvania

Ms. Louise F. Scholze
Penna. Congress of Parents and Teachers
Harrisburg
Pennsylvania

Mr. Lewis Shollerberger, Elem. Prin.
Fleetwood Area School District
Fleetwood
Pennsylvania

Mr. S. W. Simkins
Camp Hill JSHS
24th and Chestnut Streets
Camp Hill, Pennsylvania 17011

Mr. Arthur Sinclair
Plum Borough Schools
Pittsburgh
Pennsylvania 15239

Ms. Dorothy Stanley
Penna. Congress of Parents and Teachers
Harrisburg
Pennsylvania

Mr. Joseph E. Stas
Senior High School
R.D. #4
Mt. Pleasant, Pennsylvania 15666

Mr. George W. Teufel
Director of Sec. Education
Williamsport Area School District
605 West Fourth Street
Williamsport, Pennsylvania 17701

Mr. Arthur Townsend
Bedford JSHS
Bedford
Pennsylvania 15522

Mr. Dale Tyson, Jr.
District Superintendent
Great Valley School District
Charlestown Road
Devault, Pennsylvania 19432

Mr. Russell R. Urey
24 S. Franklin Street
Red Lion
Pennsylvania 17356

Mr. Raymond VanSlyke
Supervising Principal
Conneaut Lake Schools
Conneaut Lake, Pennsylvania 16316

Mr. Joseph Frist
Meadville Area Union Joint Schools
Meadville
Pennsylvania 16316

Mr. William P. Visnich
Chartiers Valley Schools
2053 Swallow Hill Road
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15220

Mr. Thomas Walker
Weatherly Area JSHS
Weatherly
Pennsylvania 18255

Mr. James Wentzel
Selinsgrove Area Jt. JSHS
Selinsgrove
Pennsylvania 17870

Mr. Robert L. Yerger
Curriculum Coordinator
Midd-West School District
Middleburg, Pennsylvania

Miss Dorothy Young
New Castle Area Schools
116 East Street
New Castle, Pennsylvania 16101